# DRUG INTERDICTION

# HEARING

BEFORE THE

## SELECT COMMITTEE ON NARCOTICS ABUSE AND CONTROL HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ONE HUNDREDTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

APRIL 30, 1987

Printed for the use of the
Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control

SCNAC-100-1-6

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
77-907 WASHINGTON : 1987

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, Congressional Sales Office
U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402

H961-5

## SELECT COMMITTEE ON NARCOTICS ABUSE AND CONTROL

(100th Congress)

CHARLES B. RANGEL, New York, *Chairman*

PETER W. RODINO, Jr., New Jersey
FORTNEY H. (PETE) STARK, California
JAMES H. SCHEUER, New York
CARDISS COLLINS, Illinois
DANIEL K. AKAKA, Hawaii
FRANK J. GUARINI, New Jersey
ROBERT T. MATSUI, California
DANTE B. FASCELL, Florida
WALTER E. FAUNTROY, District of Columbia
WILLIAM J. HUGHES, New Jersey
MEL LEVINE, California
SOLOMON P. ORTIZ, Texas
LAWRENCE J. SMITH, Florida
EDOLPHUS "ED" TOWNS, New York

BENJAMIN A. GILMAN, New York
LAWRENCE COUGHLIN, Pennsylvania
E. CLAY SHAW, Jr., Florida
MICHAEL G. OXLEY, Ohio
STAN PARRIS, Virginia
DUNCAN HUNTER, California
JOSEPH J. DioGUARDI, New York
STEWART B. McKINNEY, Connecticut
F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER, Jr., Wisconsin
ROBERT K. DORNAN, California

---

### Committee Staff

Edward H. Jurith, *Staff Director*
Elliott A. Brown, *Minority Staff Director*

# CONTENTS

Page

Opening statement of the Honorable Charles B. Rangel, chairman, House Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control ..... 1

Testimony of Adm. Paul A. Yost, commandant, U.S. Coast Guard ..... 2

Testimony of Stephen S. Trott, associate attorney general and chairman, Enforcement Coordinating Group, National Drug Policy Board ..... 6

Testimony of William von Raab, Commissioner of Customs, U.S. Customs Service ..... 9

Statement of the Honorable Benjamin A. Gilman, ranking minority member, House Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control ..... 17

Prepared statements:
- Chairman Charles B. Rangel ..... 50
- Adm. Paul A. Yost ..... 58
- Commissioner of Customs William von Raab ..... 68
- Ranking Minority Member Benjamin A. Gilman ..... 85

# HEARING ON DRUG INTERDICTION

---

THURSDAY, APRIL 30, 1987

House of Representatives,
Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control,
*Washington, DC.*

The select committee met, pursuant to call, at 10 a.m., in room 340, Cannon House Office Building, Hon. Charles B. Rangel (chairman of the committee) presiding.

Present: Representatives Charles B. Rangel, Benjamin A. Gilman, James H. Scheuer, William J. Hughes, and E. Clay Shaw, Jr.

Staff Present: Edward Jurith, Staff Director; Elliott Brown, Minority Staff Director; George Gilbert, Counsel; Barbara Stolz, Professional Staff; Jim Lawrence, Professional Staff; Rebecca Hedlund, Press Officer; Khalil Munir, Investigator; and Michael J. Kelly, Counsel.

## OPENING STATEMENT OF HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL, CHAIRMAN, HOUSE SELECT COMMITTEE ON NARCOTICS ABUSE AND CONTROL

Mr. Rangel. The Select Committee will resume its hearings that we had to cut short because of the time factor with the members and witnesses.

Is there objection from the members that I start this without the Minority? Hearing none—we are very anxious—all of your statements will be in the record. We are very anxious to work with the Administration in determining how the Congress can be more supportive of the strategy that is being developed by the Administration, and to have a better understanding as to who will be coordinating what efforts and whether or not the differences in terms of who is in charge of interdiction can be worked out without the interference of the legislative body.

What I'm saying is that I hope that your testimony today could give us the most positive view of the degree of coordination that is existing with the newly created Drug Policy Board and allow us to not get involved with who is in charge of air interdiction, whether the Attorney General or the Secretary of Defense is deciding which planes should be used. We'd like to believe that if you're going to finally coordinate our intelligence operations from the different departments that there would be somebody that would assume the responsibility of being in charge of these things. And so perhaps, we're glad that Commissioner von Raab is here. We know that he had problems before.

Steve Trott, not only it's good to see you this morning, but I'm glad that you dispelled the rumors that you would not be meeting with us shortly, notwithstanding the newspapers' reports, so that there will be some degree of continuity in your chairmanship of the Enforcement Coordinating Group of the National Drug Policy Board.

And of course if we can get the other agencies to measure up to the enthusiasm of the Coast Guard, I'm certain that we would fire more than one volley.

So why don't we start with Admiral Yost to set the tone.

[Mr. Rangel's statement appears on p. 50.]

## TESTIMONY OF ADM. PAUL A. YOST, COMMANDANT, U.S. COAST GUARD

Admiral YOST. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. It's a pleasure to appear before you today to provide an overview of the Coast Guard's efforts pursuant to the provisions of the Anti-Drug Abuse Act of 1986.

The last time we met, my time was foreshortened because of other schedules, and I appreciate very much you allowing me to come back. I will summarize my statement. But there are some parts of the statement that I would like to read now because I think they're pertinent to what we're dealing with.

The Anti-Drug Abuse Act of 1986 included $89 million for the Coast Guard's acquisition, construction and improvement account to procure law enforcement assets and $39 million in operating expenses to increase the Coast Guard's active duty strength for fiscal year 1987 and to operate two C-130s and five patrol aircraft.

In addition, the Anti-Drug Abuse Act established the United States-Bahamian Drug Interdiction Task Force, authorized a Bahamian Drug Interdiction Docking Facility and separate boat lift to be completed in the Bahamas. It codified Navy support of Coast Guard law enforcement detachments on Navy vessels and it modified the Mansfield Amendment which authorized maritime drug law enforcement action in a consenting nation's territorial seas and it of course provided additional funding for enhanced communications and surveillance capabilities. In addition, it improved 21 USC 955A which made it a more effective law enforcement tool. Let me briefly sketch our current operations.

Starting in the fall of 1984 with Operation Wagon Wheel, the Coast Guard's portion of Hat Trick I interdiction activities were taken right to the doorstep of the primary source countries of the Caribbean Basin. Operation Hat Trick was the first of several multi-agency, international operations of recent years employing maximum resources and flexibility to complement anti-drug operations being carried out by foreign forces in-country, both ashore and afloat. These operations have been an extremely effective adjunct to our own ongoing interdiction programs.

Let me discuss that for a moment. The federal efforts against drug trafficking cannot succeed without proportional pressure being placed on all modes of traffic. However, it quickly became apparent that while surface maritime trafficking was being greatly reduced during our winter operations, Hat Trick I, and Hat Trick

II, for instance, air trafficking continues virtually unabated. Cocaine and other narcotics are arriving over the maritime region by air, being airdropped to waiting boats or trans-shipped through the Bahamas by the use of fast boats into the United States. This has grown to be a major problem.

This was one of my highest priorities when I became Commandant and I had my staff devise a concept of operations that would efficiently provide Coast Guard assistance to other scheduled air interdiction efforts. I am coordinating this plan with the National Drug Enforcement Policy Board and several working groups of that Policy Board. Let me skip to the Bahamas interdiction.

The Anti-Drug Abuse Act of 1986 authorized $5 million for construction of a drug interdiction docking facility in the Bahamas to facilitate Coast Guard and Bahamian drug interdiction operations and establish a maintenance and boat lift facility usable by Coast Guard and Bahamian vessels. I have moved quickly to implement these facilities.

As requested by the government of the Bahamas, a boat lift facility will be established as a permanent Bahamian defense force base at Coral Harbor, Providence Island.

The Coast Guard drug interdiction efforts in the Bahamas include support of Operation Bahamas, Turks and Caicos (OPBAT). One Coast Guard helicopter has been providing daytime support and I plan to provide 24 hour Coast Guard support by December of this year.

In February, I entered into an agreement with the United States Customs Service to provide Bahamian helicopters and communications support authorized in the Anti-Drug Abuse Act. The Customs Service is transferring to the Coast Guard $8 million of the funds authorized to them in the 1986 Act for this purpose.

The Coast Guard is moving rapidly to implement fully the Anti-Drug Abuse Act. As we bring new assets and responsibilities from the Act on line, we are continuing to put forth the maximum effort from our existing resources. Because of the complexity of the illegal drug threat to this country and the need for a comprehensive drug education program, I cannot promise that the war will soon be won. However, through close cooperation with other agencies and your support of the President's initiatives, we hope to reduce greatly the flow of illegal drugs into our country.

This completes my testimony and I will be happy to answer questions, sir.

[Admiral Yost's statement appears on p. 58.]

Mr. Rangel. Thank you, Admiral. How do you and Commissioner von Raab decide what different approaches you may have as relates to the overlapping of interdiction, say air interdiction? Do you two go to a Board and state your case and then somebody decides what's the best strategy or do you just work out your differences and report to the Board what you think is the best effort?

Admiral Yost. Well, the Board has been deeply involved in this. Maybe Mr. Trott could answer the mechanisms of the Board better than I.

My experience has been that the Board, through its Coordinating Group, that's chaired by Stephen Trott, will appoint a Subcommittee that the Commissioner and I will be members of, and that Subcommittee will be directed to make recommendations to the Coordinating Group.

Now, when that has happened, the Commissioner and I have normally gotten together, have arrived at a solution that we both feel is best for our country and most efficient for our agencies and we will go back to the Board with that proposal.

For the most part, in fact in every case, the Board has adopted these recommendations when the Commissioner and I have agreed. Those recommendations have been placed in the minutes of the Board and thereby become part of the way we do business in this Administration.

Mr. RANGEL. Should we assume that if the same situation would come up with your need of equipment that is normally considered military equipment or radar equipment or equipment that the Coast Guard did not normally have, but you felt it was necessary in order to fulfill your mandate, that you would meet with the Secretary of Defense and to work out to determine whether there are any differences and then if there are, report that back to the Coordinating Board?

Admiral YOST. Well, of course, the Secretary of Defense is a member of the Policy Board and he has Assistant Secretary level representation on the Coordinating Group so he's there, he's an active member of the negotiations.

Mr. RANGEL. You frame the question for me and answer it then, because I don't want to get involved in the complicated procedures. It's just that I don't want this Committee, and I hope the Congress does not try to get involved as to who is right and wrong. You now have a Policy Board. I just want to find out how does it work when you want some equipment, you want radar. Defense believes that you don't, you're not supposed to have radar, we want you to be working with Navy and doing the things that you do well and you may want to do it and the Navy doesn't want to cooperate; what do you do when you have decided with your own people how you can be most effective? I assume you're telling me you don't go to the Secretary of Defense. Where do you go?

Admiral YOST. I think you're talking about an operational level sort of thing. We would go directly from the Commander of the Atlantic Area in New York directly to CincLant Fleet, a four star Navy command in Norfolk and we would say to him we've got an operation in the Caribbean. To clear this operation up we need X number of Navy ships, an oiler, X number of P-3 hour and whatever else we need. That request would also go through amendments.

The Navy has normally filled almost 100% of those requests. It's only when you get into the high priced E-2C type of aircraft that we've had a major problem and that is partly because Congress stepped in a little early in my opinion and legislated it in the final hours of Congress. People in the back room, the GS-3s and 4s, made that decision in the final hours of Congress and recommended it go to the Congressmen and the Senators and the thing was stamped. It gives the Commissioner and myself, and maybe I shouldn't speak for him, a lot of heartburn. I mean, he and I need to sit down with what we have and see if we can make it work. That's been our problem. It's been tough.

Mr. **Rangel**. I don't have any problem with your editorializing on how this came about, except that the Congress is going to get involved more and more where there is a perception that the Administration is not speaking in one voice. In other words, where there is no one to tell us that we are not acting in the national interest, where it doesn't appear, maybe it's premature since the Coordination Board may not have had an opportunity to prove its effectiveness yet, but I really don't see Congress moving against decisions that are made by the Board if we get the impression that these decisions have been made with the input of those who have the responsibility.

Admiral **Yost**. Let me answer that, then. I have been heard. I have been very vocal both in front of this Congress and within the Administration, sometimes more vocal than might even be polite, but I have been heard. Now, the Board hasn't made the final decisions on such things as Areas of Responsibility (AOR) and lead agency and that sort of thing, but they have made the final decisions on aircraft, on P-3s for example. On those kinds of things, the Board has made those decisions.

I've always been heard and I have come away from it feeling that not only have I been heard, but I can live with those decisions and I have lived with them.

Mr. **Rangel**. Well, you would agree that Commissioner von Raab has been heard as well.

Admiral **Yost**. He has been heard as well.

Mr. **Rangel**. And so what we hope is that when we hear from both of you on who is in charge of interdiction that, regardless of what you have to do to reach an agreement, that you don't give the Congress an opportunity to speculate as to who is right and who is wrong.

Admiral **Yost**. I agree with you, sir.

Mr. **Rangel**. When you come we hope you tell the Congress what you want and that we should not be in a position to second guess you on these issues.

The big problem that we have and what gets me a lot of trouble with the Administration, is that it is very, very difficult to know who is in charge and I've never heard anything that's testified indicate in the last six years that when they have a real problem, they go to the special adviser in the White House to the President on narcotic affairs. So I assume that that's not a route that we would take when we want to get the President's ear either. You don't go to him with your problems?

Admiral **Yost**. No. I work for the Drug Policy Board headed up by the Attorney General and we have Steve Trott with us who heads up the Coordinating Group that the Attorney General depends on to sort out these issues. I think he is struggling mightily right now to sort out the issues and Mr. von Raab and I are certainly being heard and it's my feeling that the Board is very close to making a decision on the very political issues that we're talking about.

Mr. **Rangel**. Well, you can depend on our support. There is a need of course to try to get someone designated that has a full time job of coordinating these efforts that the President would have confidence in, because we can't legislate a shotgun marriage between some Czar and the President, but we do hope that we can hear one single voice, right or wrong, that will have the responsibility of the coordination and the Attorney General.

There is no question that he has unique abilities that involve domestic and foreign policy as well as political responsibilities, but as relates to being the national voice and certainly Mr. Trott has demonstrated that he has the ability to tell the nation periodically that we've got a handle on this thing and I think that our country has to have leadership as well as the perception of leadership as we see the TV commentators and those of us in Congress talk about the depth of the problem, the increase of drugs that are coming in and what we're trying to do and yet somehow, with the exception of course of the First Lady, it's difficult to see national strategy, national policy being enunciated on behalf of our government. This makes our job in the Congress very difficult because the question is what are you doing?

When they say that, they are normally talking about the government and not the Congress.

I was going to go to Commissioner von Raab, but if I said something that you might feel comfortable to respond, feel free to do it.

## TESTIMONY OF STEPHEN S. TROTT, ASSOCIATE ATTORNEY GENERAL AND CHAIRMAN, ENFORCEMENT COORDINATING GROUP, NATIONAL DRUG POLICY BOARD

Mr. TROTT. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I was simply going to indicate by taking one example that the National Drug Policy Board and the Coordinating Group, now the Coordinating Groups, are devising a national strategy to attack this very large problem as you correctly describe it. And in a document which I know you have, called the National Drug Enforcement Policy Board Law Enforcement Strategy, dated January 1987, we set forth in broad brush strokes exactly what it is that we intend to do from A to Z to attack the problem.

In that connection, I can tell you that this is a document that was prepared with the input of all the agencies, that the Coordinating Group and the staff of the Policy Board put this document together and as you can see from the minutes of the Coordinating Group, we are now into an implementation mode.

May I ask if you have gotten the minutes of both the Board and the Coordinating——

Mr. RANGEL. Yes, I did.

Mr. TROTT. Good. You will be able to see some of the kinds of things we've been coping with then and the way we come together and come to closure on this. And if I can just reference the February 26 minutes, it says Policy Board Staff Member Ken Thompson presented a proposed 1987 national and international drug law enforcement strategy implementation plan. The plan involves cataloging strategic statements by chapter, identifying actions and agencies to implement those actions and tracking implementation on a regular basis.

In order to do that, we have put together an inter-agency working group so you can see that this document that's in the green covers is not just a document designed to hang out there as a strategy, but it's designed to be a working document from which is then taken our tactical approach to all of these things for implementation.

We also hope that it will be living document because this threat changes. It changes week by week. When we get tough in one area, the drug traffickers move to another area. When we jump on one approach that they have for doing things, they move to another approach. This just stands as an example of the manner in which we're trying to tackle this, to come up with a national strategy, to go for an implementation and then to make sure that it works. That's all I wanted to add.

Mr. RANGEL. Are you satisfied, Mr. Trott, that the Congress and the American people are aware of the efforts being made to fully coordinate our nation's war against narcotics as it relates to the Department of Defense, the Department of Justice, Customs and Coast Guard?

Are you satisfied that one, the average American who realizes what's going on in their streets and their communities, that you don't have to go and visit the Congressional Districts, that you've got the word out there that this Administration means business?

Mr. TROTT. I'm not sure. I think that we've done a job that's not as good as could have been done with Congress and letting you know, for example, what's going on with the National Drug Enforcement Policy Board.

When I talk to people up here, not you, of course, because you're very familiar with what's going on, because this is one of your very high priorities, but many of your colleagues don't really know what's going on so, therefore, they can come to the conclusion that something is not going on or nothing is going on and unfortunately, that's a very unfortunate situation.

I think we've been doing a much better job in the last four or five months in making it known to the American public and to the members in Congress what we are doing, and I think that people are beginning to get an idea that a lot is being done.

What I think though is that——

Mr. RANGEL. Do you really think that people have reason to be impressed as to what's being done by the government?

And I'm not really singling out the administration. I mean, by their government. Do you really think that there's been a turnaround in the attitude of the American people that we are now moving ahead to deal with this problem?

Mr. TROTT. Well, I'm not sure what the attitude of the American people is. When I talk to people, I find many people extremely impressed with what's going on. If you look at where we started in 1930 and where we are now and you chronicle the advances that we made, I think they're really remarkable.

The difficulty is if you——

Mr. RANGEL. What type of successes are you talking about?

Mr. TROTT. Well, just simply in terms of organization itself.

Mr. RANGEL. No, please, Mr. Trott, I'm trying to talk to you just as a fellow citizen and partner in government. It's hardly going to impress anybody on the block that I live in Harlem about the depth of the organization that the administration has, but when you say our recent successes, I'm assuming that there have been things that have happened that you kind of feel that the American people feel confident, not that we're winning, but that we are involved in a war.

I don't want to be facetious, but I think if you ask the American people, are we involved in Central America and do we want to see Democracy and do we want to run the Communists out and are we doing enough, I think you'll get a response.

Mr. TROTT. Well, let me go through some of the things that I consider to be successes. First of all, the South Florida Task Force was set up in 1982 on January 28. That's a Vice Presidential mission and I think it represents the coming together of many agencies to tackle drug trafficking as it represents a threat to South Florida and to the United States.

Mr. RANGEL. If we were to talk about that, you would assume that the average American would know that the Vice President of the United States headed up a task force to stop drugs from coming in in South Florida? That he's spoken out on the issue and that if they don't, they just are not aware of what's going on in the country?

Mr. TROTT. If the average American has been reading the newspapers and watching television since 1982, that average American would know that there's a South Florida Task Force and the Vice President is intimately involved.

Mr. RANGEL. That answers me.

Mr. TROTT. The information has been out there.

Mr. RANGEL. Listen, I just want to know what your feeling is that when one thinks about the Vice President of the United States, they would normally associate that with heading up antidrug projects for the President and for the United States with Congressional support and more particularly in South Florida and probably hold him out to be the protector of our borders?

Mr. TROTT. Part of the difficulty here is that the average American, there are many average Americans who don't read the newspapers or watch television and I don't say that critically at all. Some people are turned off by the whole process and they pursue their lives in another way, but if an average American had been watching this——

Mr. RANGEL. We should discuss this over a drink because the average American knows who the heck Colonel North is and what he's doing and he is just as sophisticated as anyone else.

If you want to believe that the Vice President is pictured as one of our leaders out there in fighting this drug problem and covering Florida from the borders, then for purposes of our hearing, I'll accept it.

Who would you think would closely follow the Vice President in being perceived as one of the national leaders in this? And we'll leave out the First Lady since you and I agree that she is a natural leader in this.

Mr. TROTT. Mr. Chairman, all I'm saying is that the information has been out there in the newspapers and on television. Whether people have picked it up or not is another question, but let me, you know, I don't want to get off on what people know and what they don't know, but I was intimately involved in the Watergate situation and——

Mr. **Rangel**. So was I.

Mr. **Trott**. I can't—one day I was riding around with a cab driver and cab drivers usually know what's going on and the cab driver said where do you work? I said the District Attorney's office. He says oh yeah, what are you doing? I said I'm working on part of the Watergate thing and he said, what's that? And I said, well, that's just this big thing where the President of the United States is in the process of resigning and he said, oh, I never heard of that, I never pay attention to——

Mr. **Rangel**. I served on the Judiciary Committee that was involved in the impeachment and the average citizen only knows I was involved in Watergate and wonders what have I done since. Let me say this. I'm trying to make your job easier. I know it doesn't sound like it, but when you get back to the Coordinating Committee, if you're hanging your hat on the Vice President, I would suggest, just as an elected official that you might ask other people in the administration to give him a hand in letting the rest of the country know what he's doing because quite frankly, I don't remember the last press conference the Vice President has had on this issue and I hold myself out to be pretty average and I do read newspapers and I just don't remember it.

Mr. **Trott**. Congressman, I can't tell you what people know. I can just simply tell you what has been done and what is being done and the South Florida Task Force is a significant accomplishment.

Mr. **Rangel**. Well, Mr. Trott, you talk about the Congress. We cannot help unless we know and there is no question in my mind that I know that the Vice President has made a great effort. I think the Secretary of State has made a great effort.

Mr. **Trott**. That's correct.

Mr. **Rangel**. And I heard yesterday from General Olmstead that the Secretary of Defense is making a great effort.

Mr. **Trott**. That is also true.

Mr. **Rangel**. I'm just saying that when we ask what are we doing, that we can do a lot more in letting people know what Admiral Yost is doing and they know what Customs is doing and we're very anxious to get the word out as to what you're doing.

## TESTIMONY OF WILLIAM VON RAAB, COMMISSIONER OF CUSTOMS, U.S. CUSTOMS SERVICE

Mr. **von Raab**. Mr. Chairman, just one point, if I might, since we've raised the issue.

The Vice President has a press conference on May 4 in Texas and it is on drugs.

Mr. **Rangel**. Let me tell you something, Commissioner, no one knows better than you how to get the attention of the press and I'm certain that the Vice President has no problem, except you have to have something to say and if there is any way that we can be supportive of his statement, you just count this Select Committee in, but it's going to be very hard for us to do this when the press is talking about the differences you have.

Now, We don't want the minutes of your Policy Board to be in the Washington Post every morning, but someone should be able to say, not report just the differences and the disputes that are taking place, but the policies that have been established and the agencies and department heads that are supporting that policy. And I tell you if you do that, you would achieve one of the things which I know that you are very anxious to do and that is to keep the Congress out of making the type of decisions that some of us may believe that there's just a vacuum and the Czar is one of the areas where it is perceived that someone has to have this job on a full time basis. I'm convinced, Mr. Trott, that perhaps the Czar that we're talking about may be you.

On the other hand, I'm convinced that the table of organizations that there would be a lot of people that would not agree on the other side, that this is exactly what they're talking about.

Mr. TROTT. We're working on that.

Mr. RANGEL. But let's hear from Commissioner von Raab and what you're doing and how the Congress can be more helpful.

Mr. VON RAAB. Mr. Chairman, I gave my prepared statement at our last hearing.

I was hopeful that I might actually at this hearing be up there with you asking questions of these two gentlemen, but apparently that's not the case. So I am prepared to answer any questions you may have and I will stand on the statement that I gave at the first part of this hearing.

[Commissioner von Raab's statement appears on p. 68.]

Mr. RANGEL. Well, you are the person, your outfit is responsible for interdiction. Is this a responsibility that you think should be shared and if yes, how?

Mr. VON RAAB. Yes, it should be shared for a number of reasons. One, because the job is so big that we should bring to bear all of the resources that we have on it and there are different organizations that have different expertise to bring to the interdiction mission and it is being shared.

There is a joint effort that has been ongoing for as long as I've been around and before that between the Coast Guard and Customs Service. In Operation Alliance on the Southwest Border there is a major joint Federal and State and local effort dealing with interdiction in which the Border Patrol and the Customs Services are cross designated and are conducting each other's responsibilities, Border Patrol primarily between ports of entry, Customs primarily at ports of entry. DEA and Customs are working very closely on the Southwest border. As I might point out by the way, they are working particularly closely at the airport in Queens, JFK.

Mr. RANGEL. Is there a joint connection with that airport operation? Because we intend to have hearings and we won't have it——

Mr. VON RAAB. Yes. That is one of the issues with which this group, which is called JINSO, which is Joint Narcotics Investigation Group, between DEA and Customs. Very successful, under the leadership of Bob Stutman of DEA and Dave River of Customs. It's really a super organization and it's sort of an example to the rest of the country as to how these things can really work well. So there is——

Mr. RANGEL. Let me underscore that. I think that Stutman in New York has done a fantastic job in bringing and coordinating the efforts including labor and resources.

Mr. von Raab. He's done a very good job.

Mr. Rangel. And I'd like to state for the record, that I've heard no one complain in the Congress about the success in bringing together task forces in the operations your outfit has been doing. Our problem, I'd like to emphasize, is just in terms of trying to establish is there a national strategy? Who's in charge of air interdiction? That's your shop? Are you satisfied with that?

Mr. von Raab. Well, first of all this issue, as has been indicated, is before the Drug Policy Board and I don't know that it necessarily will move the issue along well to debate it here.

Mr. Rangel. Let's drop it then. We don't want to make any headlines.

Mr. von Raab. Oh, headlines would be fine. The Board will be reporting to Congress, I guess May 5 or 6, or something?

Mr. Trott. Beginning on May 12th.

Mr. von Raab. May 12th. And they will be making a statement, a definitive statement on that issue and I think it's probably just as well to wait for that.

Mr. Rangel. Okay. Well, let me say this, the Committee is about to set up our schedule for hearings. I would want to say to Mr. Trott that where there are areas that you think Congressional hearings would be beneficial to our Nation and supported by the Administration, domestic—we work very closely with the State Department in trying to make certain that whatever arrangements they are making with these countries that we let them know that the Congress are supporting those even when we disagree, but we do believe that foreign policy has to be carried out by the Executive Branch and so we go to these countries being supportive of those things.

I assume that under your title, the foreign policy is one of the issues that you're involved in, Mr. Trott?

Mr. Trott. Yes. Of course on the Policy Board itself you have the Secretary of State sitting and on the Coordinating Group you have Ann Wrobleski, the Assistant Secretary in Charge of International Narcotics Matters and foreign policy and matters involving foreign countries come up every day in the Narcotics Board.

Mr. Rangel. Okay. Let's—Commissioner, have you concluded your statement? Suppose we hear from Mr. Trott and then the members can inquire.

Mr. Trott. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I simply wanted to add in connection with my statement last time and with respect of what I've already said that I believe that the agencies that are a part of the law against narcotics trafficking are all working together quite well and I think if you look at what has been accomplished rather than just those areas where there still is room for improvement, you will see that overall we've made tremendous progress since 1980 when essentially nobody was working together and there weren't any organizations, inter-agency organizations, designed to produce the progress that's very necessary.

I already mentioned the South Florida Task Force, but the Organized Crime Drug Enforcement Task Force, a Presidential initiative started in October of 1982, bringing the FBI into the drug war for the first time and now with 1,000 agents a year working on big drug cases has produced in the vicinity of 10,000 drug defendants in the Federal Courts of the United States.

The National Narcotics Border Interdiction System which was referenced earlier provides, assets, military assets among other things for various task forces that are operating around the country. The Drug Enforcement Policy Board of course became active in '84 and since that time we've put together Operation Alliance which the Commissioner of Customs referred to along the Southwest border.

That involves a massive infusion of agents, cross designation of personnel and assumes they can get up and go in the aerostat, along that part of the United States to help with the interdiction program.

We've also been very successful in increasing the number of eradication programs around the world from one in 1980 to I think 14 right now.

We've also pursued vigorously extradition programs and mutual legal assistance treaty programs. In reference to a question you asked earlier, I think most Americans do know that Carlos Ledher is in the United States and I can chronicle for you directly that that is the result of good work done by the National Drug Enforcement Policy Board and by the Coordinating Group with a lot of agencies working on this and it indicates our interest in making sure that there is no haven for drug traffickers anywhere in the world. That drug traffickers, once identified by countries, will be extradited, will be prosecuted and hopefully, after fair trials, will be imprisoned.

~~So~~ the word here that I'd like to leave you with is that the structures are there, the institutional setup is there and the attitude I believe is now there. Cooperating is primarily in my view a question of attitude. If somebody comes to the table wanting to be part of the solution, rather than part of the problem, you can get things done. And I believe that the agencies and the agency heads are now as committed to the inter-agency coordinating process as they are to making sure that their own agency fulfills its particular mission as conceived by the agency, of course, and by Congress.

So I think the good news is that we are moving in the right direction.

The bad news, and I know that everybody in the room would agree, is that the drug problem still looms around us and in front of us as huge. I don't think that what we have been unable to accomplish is a measurement of our lack of coordination or our lack of will to tackle this. It's a measurement of how big the problem is and how different it can be and how much it can change as we begin to hammer on it.

And that's why we have come to the realization as I know you have, Mr. Chairman, that this has to be a two sided approach. Law enforcement has to continue to be tough and get tougher, but we also need good efforts and these have to come from the grass roots of America against drug usage.

Every time I go to South America and ask questions about what are you doing down here to stem the flow of drugs into the United States, they also ask how are your programs to knock down the market in your country going?

You still have millions of Americans spending billions of dollars a year on these drugs and we can guarantee you that if that market would begin to dry up, maybe some of this production down here would slow up also.

Mr. RANGEL. How do you answer that?

Mr. TROTT. We absolutely do not fingerpoint. We admit that there is two sides to this equation and we point out the programs in which we are vigorously involved in the United States to knock down the market. We always reference Nancy Reagan's involvement to make sure that it's clear as a matter of national policy and interest.

Mr. RANGEL. What is the First Lady's budget on knocking down demand?

Mr. TROTT. You'd have to ask the White House.

Mr. RANGEL. You know I've been very fair with you. Now, since you are telling foreigners, tell the members of Congress, that if you're using the First Lady's program and I admit that it's pretty dramatic, what is her budget in this national effort that you have used as an example of what we are doing to reduce demand?

Mr. TROTT. Mr. Chairman, I'm not familiar with the First Lady's budget. Indeed, there may not even be one.

Mr. RANGEL. Let's say that answers my question. What is the second backup position that you give these foreigners that ask what are we doing about demand as relates to the Federal effort? What do you answer? Because quite honestly, they ask me the same question in my District, and I'd like to be able, if you feel comfortable with your answers, I'd like to use it myself.

What is Secretary Bennett doing about reducing demand and education?

Mr. TROTT. Well, first of all, have you seen the very excellent book "Schools Without Drugs," the red book?

Mr. RANGEL. Okay, so we've got Nancy Reagan and we've got that red book. What program has been developed by Secretary Bennett and presented to the Coordinating Board and probably to the United States Congress so that we can get out there and tell those foreigners what we're doing in the area of reducing demand?

Because everyone agrees that we're losing the battle on production and source. What do you tell them we're doing, our government?

Mr. TROTT. Well, I start by telling them first of all that we have very vigorous law enforcement programs in the United States to try to create a deterrent against the use and trafficking inside the United States. We've made the point and we continue to make the point that it's against the law and we're encouraging everybody to enforce the law.

I further indicate that we have a fifty state eradication program in the United States called DELTA-9 that for the last few years has been very successful in cutting down on domestic cultivation, which is a question that they also ask.

I also tell them about the many private groups in the United States, the National Federation of Parents for Drug-Free Youth, now the 10,000 "Just Say No" clubs. I tell them about B.J. McConn——

Mr. RANGEL. That's Nancy Reagan's program.

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Chairman, can I ask the witness to respond to the question that you put to him? Namely, what are the major Federal programs that are addressed to reducing demand? He seems to be dancing around the question.

Mr. TROTT. The question was what do I tell the Latin Americans and I'm telling——

Mr. SCHEUER. About what we are doing to reduce demand.

Mr. TROTT. And I'm telling you exactly what I tell them, which was the question.

Mr. SCHEUER. And you talk about the book. How many copies of this book have been printed and to what school systems have they been distributed?

Mr. TROTT. We can supply that for the record. I don't have the information at my fingertips.

Mr. SCHEUER. Do you have anybody here who can give you that information?

Mr. TROTT. I don't believe so.

Mr. SCHEUER. It's my understanding that a miniscule number of those books have been produced and I would simply like you to stick to the question that the Chairman addressed to you. What is the Administration doing, what is the funding, what is the structure of the programs that are being created by the national government to reduce demand for drugs in this country? And please don't tell us about private, non-profit groups. Tell us about what the Federal government is doing.

Mr. TROTT. Well, should I answer your question, Mr. Chairman, or the new question that's been asked of me?

Mr. RANGEL. I really had thought that I had raised the same question. There is no question in my mind that churches and synagogues and community leaders are concerned about this crisis and they're having community rallies and they're making education efforts, but since U.S. Attorneys are going into the schools and New York City police are going into the schools and law enforcement is now throwing up their hands, not just foreigners and asking what are we doing about demand, the question basically would be as a representative of the Federal government, what would you say Secretary Bennett, who is the keeper of the standards of education, is doing as relates to drug education or better still, what is the Federal program to reduce demand?

And of course coming from New York where we've had 50,000 arrests, that has not really been a deterrent as relates to demand.

Mr. TROTT. Well, I would refer you in the first instance to the National Drug Enforcement Policy Board strategy and to the Executive Summary if you wish to read exactly what we describe drug law enforcement's role in reducing the demand for drugs is. In connection with DEA, Jack Lawn and DEA have a very active program involving the high school coaches of America——

Mr. RANGEL. Please, Mr. Trott, I hate to interrupt, but there are just some of us, especially some former prosecutors, that would like to think of our law enforcement people in terms of investigations, indictments, prosecutions, convictions and putting them in jail.

When I ask you the questions, it's not as a representative from Justice, but as the coordinator of the overall Policy Board. I'm convinced that the Admiral and the Commission, whenever they get an opportunity to talk about the dangers of drugs, that they and their people do that and it's laudable. But I'm asking as the Coordinator, now, if Bennett has no program and we don't believe he does, then it means the Federal government has no program.

And if the Secretary is going to resist the Congress shoving one down his throat, we want to know whether that attitude has your support and if it doesn't what can we do rather than just appropriate money, to have the money just being shoved out there and not having any Federal program?

It doesn't make us feel comfortable in dealing with foreigners or our constituents to say that we are involved in a serious demand reduction program, but we cannot find that program anywhere in the Federal government.

And again, I speak to you, Mr. Trott, as the Coordinator of the national effort and not in Justice, because I know the DEA got their basketball program and the U.S. Attorneys are out there in the schools and I laud them for that effort and I'm supporting an increase in their budgets, to put people in jail, that is.

But are you satisfied that we have a Federal program in education to reduce demand?

Mr. Trott. I would have to refer you to Secretary Bennett to talk about what he's doing.

And let me simply indicate here, Mr. Chairman, if you look at the Executive Order that has recently been signed, you will see that the new National Drug Policy Board has two coordinating groups. I am the Chairman of the law enforcement side, not the education, treatment, prevention and rehabilitation side. That Chairperson is Dr. Macdonald from the White House and I would respectfully ask that you discuss this subject with him. That is his expertise and we have an understanding that I won't answer questions for him in terms of what he is supposed to be in charge of and he won't answer questions for me of what I'm supposed to be in charge of.

Mr. Rangel. I'm going to yield to Mr. Gilman. And that's your understanding with him. But we're all in the same boat and you better tell him to give you better answers, because we need better answers, because to the guy on the block, his saying that that's not my job and that's a different shop, we should know as advocates and partners in government what we are doing. And when the answer is that we are doing nothing, talking with Dr. Macdonald is not going to help.

Now, I realize that he has just been assigned to this position, so in all fairness to him, perhaps he hasn't even had a chance to talk with Secretary Bennett, but Secretary Bennett is one that has allowed his views to be known all over the country and perhaps in the world. And these foreigners that ask the questions, they're not asking these questions as friends. They're asking these questions to embarrass us and to relieve them of their international responsibility to abide by international treaties. And they would have us believe that it's our moral responsibility to reduce demand and that they have no responsibility to eradicate. And unfortunately, we don't have answers for them. We don't have a program for them.

Mr. Trott. Mr. Chairman, I of course can't dispute that somebody may have said that to you, but no foreign government has ever said that directly to me in the many, many, many meetings that I've had with them, starting with Enrique Parejo, the Minister of Justice from Colombia, who was shot five times last February. In my first meeting with Enrique Parejo, shortly after Minister of Justice Lara Borilla was killed in April of 1984, we discussed the problem of demand. But I can tell you that Enrique Parejo said we don't blame the United States for this problem. We don't assign the whole problem to the demand side of the equation. We have drug abuse problems in our own country. And we are the producers, and we take responsibility for that. The question isn't to fingerpoint and to look for the blame. The question is, how are we going to work together to overcome these problems? And this is the same attitude that has been taken by the Mexican government when I've met with them probably in excess of 50 times. And this was the same attitude that was also taken at the Ministers of Justice Conference in Puerto Vallarta.

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out to the witness that the President of Mexico on American television, when he was asked about what Mexico was doing to reduce the problem of drugs said, look, if there wasn't any demand—it's a structural problem, he said. If there wasn't any demand, there wouldn't be any drug problem and he essentially said, the monkey is on your back. That's the President of Mexico, Mr. de la Madrid.

Mr. TROTT. That's not what the President of Mexico has said to me and it's not what the Attorney General of Mexico said to me.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Trott, let me tell you, in this area they probably are dealing with you in a more sophisticated way than they deal with Members of Congress and perhaps they think that you represent the President, but take our word for it, every member of Parliament, every President, every foreign minister shoves it right up our noses as to it's our responsibility. You're sitting next to a guy, Commissioner von Raab, that they believe that there is no border there, that they're entitled to just do what they want. It's a question of supply and demand and we're the demand. If you could have listened to the Bolivians with the contract that they're negotiating with the U.S., it would enrage our American farmers, the subsidies they're requesting not to grow. But again, they're saying it's our problem. The only thing that has recently toned down this arrogance that they have is the fact that they are becoming victims of the production which is involved in their country, but I would suggest to you that you talk with Ann Wrobleski and she will contradict everything that you have said. I don't know about Secretary Shultz because maybe they tell him what they tell you, but even in the back rooms when we meet with the Mexicans, they talk about it like it's our problem, that we have to put up our money in order to mutually resolve the problem. It's an arrogance that hurts and the problem is that we don't have answers for that arrogance. We beat them down and I think Ben Gilman is the one that takes them on every time. But we've got too many battle scars from these people as we've gone to the different drug producing countries and there's not one, you start with Mexico, you go to the Bahamas, you go to Thailand, to Peru, Bolivia, Colombia and the international treaties mean nothing. It's an American problem and we're going to have to deal with it by reducing demand and after we give up the millions of dollars to Bolivia, the Ambassador told us we're going up the trade, someone else is going to pick it up and we can't argue with them because to some degree they're right. And the reason we're pushing so fiercely is that we can't tell them about Mrs. Reagan's efforts. We just don't have anything to tell them. Let me yield to Mr. Gilman.

## STATEMENT BY HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN, RANKING MINORITY MEMBER, HOUSE SELECT COMMITTEE ON NARCOTICS ABUSE AND CONTROL

Mr. **Gilman**. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I just want to welcome our distinguished panelists before us today, and I hope you recognize that as we do this oversight, we are very much concerned about the effectiveness of the major bill that was passed by the Congress last year with support from both sides if the aisle, we want to make sure that the dollars are going to be well spent and properly spent.

Despite all the money we're throwing at the problem, we find it still coming in by the boat load, by the plane load and we're only making a small dent.

Some 178 tons of coca was estimated as coming into the States last year with only 28 tons being seized, the remaining 150 tons being consumed by our citizenry.

We estimate there are two to five million cocaine abusers, over half a million heroin abusers and addicts in our country and over $130 billion illicit narcotics trade going on.

I agree with what you said, Mr. Trott, about the extensiveness of the problem and how complex it is and I'm pleased to hear that there is agency coordination finally, but we still hear about the turf wars.

For example, just this week there was a problem with regard to the aircraft. For goodness sake, we've got a great deal of extradition problems we're dealing with. I know of 34 extradition problems. As a matter of fact, Colombia now has a problem in their extradition and that was the last extradition and the President tells us he doubts whether we can extradite anyone at this time.

Mexico has a problem extraditing. Who's extraditing at the present time? Where is there an effective extradition agreement right now, Mr. Trott?

Mr. **Trott**. Well, I'm not as pessimistic as you are about the situation in Colombia.

Mr. **Gilman**. Well, this is the President of Colombia, just a couple of weeks ago told the Chairman and I that he doubts very much that he could extradite a trafficker today because of the intimidation in the courts, because of the problem with the way it was originally framed and the court has found problems in the treaty and he said that today, he could not extradite anyone.

Mr. **Trott**. I'm not saying he doubts that he could, but I'm not going to throw up my hands and say that's the end of extradition with Colombia. We intend to—if I can give you some background.

Mr. **Gilman**. Well, tell me what other country do we have a valid extradition agreement with at the present time?

Mr. TROTT. Well, we have extradition treaties with many countries and you're——

Mr. GILMAN. I'm waiting.

Mr. TROTT. If I could say one thing, I agree with you, Congressman. I'm not at all satisfied with the status of extradition. I'm not at all satisfied with it. I think we're still way, way behind the power curve and until every country starts to get out of its own skin and cooperate as you suggest is important, and transfer people back and forth to stand trial, we're going to continue to be ineffective.

Mr. GILMAN. Well, what do we have to do to get effective extradition agreements with these people?

Mr. TROTT. Well, let me, if I can give you a history——

Mr. GILMAN. They're harboring major narcotics traffickers. The New York Times special section a few weeks ago, on the front page, talked about the cocaine Colombian drug dealers who are virtually controlling the economy of Colombia.

What are we doing to get these people to court and to prosecute them?

Mr. TROTT. If I can give you the history of the situation in Colombia. Although we have a treaty with Colombia that would permit the extradition of Colombian nationals to the United States and vice versa because these have to be reciprocal, which would permit the extradition of American nationals to Colombia to stand trial, up until April 30th of 1984, the Colombian government would not extradite Colombian nationals to the United States, simply stating as a matter of discretion and sovereignty that it wasn't appropriate to do that and they would take care of their own problems and we should take care of ours.

As you know, however, the Colombian government began to perceive that Colombia was becoming a haven for major drug traffickers and that policy was making it impossible or difficult for Colombia to battle drug traffickers.

Some of the officials in the Colombian government, and Lara Bonilla was one of the first, began to speak up in Colombia and indicate that we should step forward to the center stage and be willing to extradite Colombians to the United States to stand trial.

As you know, it was for that stand that Mr. Lara Bonilla was assassinated. President Betancur immediately moved in, announced that since the primary reason for the assassination was the support for the extradition treaty, that he would give the drug traffickers exactly what they didn't want, extradition and he appointed Enrique Parejo to become the new Minister of Justice. That's when Enrique Parejo came to the United States and talked to me and said, we are prepared to change our policy and we will extradite Colombians to stand trial in the United States as long as you——

Mr. GILMAN. If I might interrupt. I know the problems. I know they attempted to assassinate Parejo and I know the intimidation of the courts. We stood outside that Supreme Court and saw how they burned out the highest court and they had to go in with the tanks.

But the whole question is, what are we doing to try to work around these things? What are we doing to get extradition amongst those drug producing countries?

Mr. TROTT. Well, if I may continue——

Mr. GILMAN. And we know the history, Mr. Trott. We know all of the history already.

Mr. TROTT. We set up within our mechanism in the United States a Colombian opportunities working group and we set out to make sure that extradition would work. As a result of that, I personally went to Colombia and met Enrique Parejo in Colombia and we discussed for hours the sensitivities of——

Mr. GILMAN. Can we extradite from Colombia today, Mr. Trott?

Mr. TROTT. I hope so.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILMAN. Yes, I will.

Mr. HUGHES. Obviously our inability to extradite is one aspect, but I understand we're not even trying any cases in Colombia. They've lost thirty judges through assassination. The second Chief Justice has resigned because of intimidation and I have information that they are not even trying cases.

Mr. TROTT. Well, that's not the information that we have.

Mr. RANGEL. Please don't push yourself into this. Please.

We were sent down to Bogota by the Speaker. I asked this question of the President of Colombia, the chief judge of Colombia. They're embarrassed. For years there hasn't been any prosecution in the civil courts. The cases——

Mr. TROTT. Well, that's right. They suspended prosecution in the civil court and they took it into the military court and——

Mr. RANGEL. And the Supreme Court has said that's unconstitutional so when Mr. Hughes asked the question, if you're not doing it in the civil court, if you're not doing it in the military court, if you're not extraditing, what is your opinion of what's going on in Colombia?

Mr. TROTT. Mr. Chairman, I can only answer one question at a time. The question is what's going on with extradition.

The question on extradition is that as recently as two months ago, Colombia extradited one of the major drug traffickers in the world, Carlos Lehder to the United States. We will continue to work with the government of Colombia to try to work——

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Trott, we're talking about three weeks ago and the President and the Justices say that they can't extradite. We'll leave that one alone.

The one question that was pending was the one by Mr. Hughes and his question was that he understood that there was no prosecutions in the government of Colombia as related to narcotic traffickers.

Mr. TROTT. I can't answer your question like that.

Mr. RANGEL. That's better because you said not to your knowledge.

Mr. HUGHES. That's the problem with these extraditions. Basically they are not making any cases, let alone extraditing.

Mr. RANGEL. It's bad.

Mr. TROTT. I'm not disagreeing with that at all. There is a very critical situation in Colombia. There's no doubt about it.

Mr. **Rangel**. We have a second bell. Is there a time problem here?

We'll be back in ten minutes.

[Whereupon, at 11:10 a.m., the Committee took a brief recess.]

Mr. **Gilman**. All right, Mr. Trott, back to my question. What are we doing about extradition?

We've had a treaty for quite a while now and it hasn't proven to be very effective. What else can we do? All we have now is an agreement with Colombia that isn't working at the present time because of their problems internally.

There are problems with Mexico on extradition. What more can we do? Give us a status report, you're the enforcement person. What can we do? What do you recommend that we should be doing instead of just talking more and more with heads and trying to convince?

Mr. **Trott**. Well, if you start from the proposition that a foreign country has a sovereignty that has to be respected, and I do, then I think that you——

Mr. **Gilman**. I think we all respect the sovereignty thing, that's not the answer respecting the sovereignty.

How do we conclude an agreement that would be an effective extradition agreement?

Mr. **Trott**. You have to convince the foreign governments to do that, as they were convinced in the situation with Colombia. I don't think you can beat them into it, if that's what you're suggesting.

Mr. **Gilman**. I'm not suggesting anything. I'm asking you, you're the policy person. Apparently it hasn't worked up to now. What does the Policy Board say about it?

Mr. **Trott**. We are very disturbed that we have not made as much progress as we would like. However, we are not discouraged and we will continue to work on this every meeting that we have and we do.

Mr. **Gilman**. Well, you're saying more of the same apparently, more of the same approach. Is that what you're saying to us?

Mr. **Trott**. That's exactly what I'm saying to you.

Let me give you an example of how this can work. When we first started sitting down with Sergio Garcia Ramirez, the Attorney General of Mexico, a little bit over two years ago, we pointed out the importance of the extradition program and the importance of concluding a mutual legal assistance treaty with the country of Mexico.

At that time it was the sense of Mexico that a mutual legal assistance treaty was not possible, but every time Mr. Meese met with the Mexicans, we kept bringing this up and bringing it up and bringing it up and finally, at a meeting in Cancun, Sergio Garcia Ramirez agreed that circumstances were such as to indicate this was a good idea.

We now have agreed upon text and the country of Mexico has that text now and they're going through their process which is similar to the process that we have going now and we believe that we are going to have a mutual assistance treaty with Mexico by the end of this year.

That's a significant accomplishment.

Mr. **Gilman**. Is that an extradition treaty?

Mr. **Trott**. No, that's not, but I'm telling you this is the way these things work and in terms of extradition, we have an extradition treaty with Mexico, but they will not send Mexican nationals to the United States.

What they have said is that they have jurisdiction under their system to prosecute Mexican nations in Mexico for crimes committed anywhere in the world. It's not subscribed by territorial—the territoriality of jurisdiction.

Mr. **Gilman**. But we've got a legal assistance agreement, the Janus Agreement, haven't we, with Mexico?

Mr. **Trott**. That's what I was getting at.

Mr. **Gilman**. That hasn't been working, has it?

Mr. **Trott**. The Janus Program has been disappointing is where I was going. I'm simply trying to tell you what it is that we've been working on.

Mr. **Gilman**. But how long has that been disappointing? It seems to me it's for years that that hasn't worked effectively or worked at all for that matter.

Mr. **Trott**. No, it's working. We used to use it when I was in the District Attorney's office in Los Angeles County and the Mexican government, on our behalf, prosecuted a number of Mexicans.

Mr. **Gilman**. How long ago was that, Mr. Trott?

Mr. **Trott**. Four years.

Mr. **Gilman**. It seems to me that in the last four or five years we haven't had Janus working, we haven't had extradition with Mexico, we now don't have a workable extradition with Colombia. What can we do to put some more teeth in all of this so that we can extradite the drug traffickers and bring them to trial?

Mr. **Trott**. We have to work tirelessly, as we are, to convince foreign sovereign nations to become full participants and I hope that we will be able to make some progress at the upcoming U.N. conference in Vienna in Austria.

Mr. **Gilman**. You expect to get some extradition work done at Vienna?

Mr. **Trott**. Absolutely.

Mr. **Gilman**. Well, I hope your expectations are going to be met.

Mr. **Trott**. By continuing to meet with the leaders of foreign countries who have something to do with this.

Mr. **Gilman**. Mr. Trott, you talked about eradication programs. Where do we have an effective coca eradication program at work at the present time?

Mr. **Trott**. If I may add just one thing. In the Criminal Division where I worked for three years, in 1980 we really did not even have an office of international affairs. We created an office of international affairs specifically for the purpose of managing extradition and mutual legal assistance.

That office of international legal affairs now has more than 20 lawyers and their primary mission is not only to manage, but to negotiate and promote extradition and mutual legal assistance.

Mr. **Gilman**. Well, what's been the accomplishment of that office since 1980?

Mr. **Trott**. In the Cayman Islands, for example, we had no agreement at all to get financial information. The Cayman Islands is one of the three most serious bank secrecy jurisdiction problems in the world. We now have an agreement that we've negotiated effectively by the office of international affairs with the Cayman Islands——

Mr. **Gilman.** I appreciate hearing that, but has that office brought about any extradition agreement?

Mr. **Trott.** That office managed every Colombian extradition that there is and Mr. Meese just came back from Belgium signing a mutual legal assistance treaty with Belgium. That office produced the political offense exception to fix to the treaties involving terrorism. We'll supply you, Mr. Gilman, for the record with a list of the accomplishments of the office of international affairs.

Mr. **Gilman.** And I would appreciate receiving that.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that that be made a part of the record at this point.

Could you tell me, Mr. Trott, my time is going to—about eradication. Where do we have an effective eradication program at the present time in Latin America?

Mr. **Trott.** Mr. Gilman, may I respectfully refer that question to Ann Wrobleski? That's her turf.

Mr. **Gilman.** Mr. Trott, on the Medellin, you referred it to Dr. Macdonald. On eradication, you're referring it to Ann Wrobleski. I thought you were part of a Strategy Board and I know that you divided it up, but I thought the Strategy Board did oversight on the national drug and international drug problem.

Don't you folks meet together or are you in a separate room with a sealed compartment? Don't you folks meet and discuss these problems together? Isn't there any coordination or discussion about the national and international problem?

I hope you'll answer that for us. I'm frankly frustrated by your response that you'll refer this to another agency. It seems to me that the National Strategy Board was created to be an oversight of all of the problems.

That's what we're told when we talk about a drug czar and the Administration says we don't need a drug czar, we've got a National Strategy Board, we have the Attorney General, we have other people who deal in that kind of oversight and here you are coming to us from that Board saying go to Wrobleski, go to Macdonald, I don't have the answer.

I think I'd be embarrassed to make that kind of a response, Mr. Trott.

Mr. Trott, could you tell us where you have an adequate eradication program in Latin America?

Mr. **Trott.** May I have a second?

Mr. **Rangel.** Well, you said in coca. Why don't you help him and tell him we don't have one?

Mr. **Gilman.** To my knowledge, I don't know of an effective eradication program that's going on. Mexico had a good one, it's been faltering and the rest of Latin America, I think is without an effective eradication program unless Mr. Trott has some information that we are not aware of.

Mr. **Trott.** Well, are you talking about eradication programs or coca eradication programs?

Mr. **Rangel.** Coca leaf eradication, that cocaine comes from, that we have the agreements with that you mention in your testimony. 14 I think you have here.

Mr. **Gilman**. You mentioned, you said there are 14 eradication programs out there.

Mr. **Trott**. Yeah, we do and I—well, I guess I could—it's hard for me to say effective because I guess your definition of effective and my definition of effective would be pretty much the same.

Mr. **Gilman**. Well, let's strike effective. Tell us where the eradication programs are.

Mr. **Trott**. I'd start by indicating that Mexico involves an eradication program. We have—the INM works with the Mexican Federal Judicial Police to eradicate marijuana and opium poppies that are growing in Mexico.

Mr. **Gilman**. And are we satisfied with the effectiveness of that program?

Mr. **Trott**. I think the program has done much, much better in the last two years. The last thing that DEA told me was that they are satisfied with the general increase in statistics, but not satisfied and neither is Mexico in terms of the ability of the program to cope with the problem.

The growth of illicit drugs in Mexico for a long time was fairly limited to certain areas and what the Mexican government now reports to us, confirmed by DEA, is that traffickers have spread out throughout the country making the problem a lot more difficult to cope with and it's our belief right now that the fleet that the Mexican government is utilizing may not be sufficient territorially to reach the extent of the problem.

So in that respect, DEA does tell me that the verification information they're getting out of Mexico is extremely good.

In Belize, I'm notified by Ann Wrobleski that the marijuana situation, the eradication program there seems to be going well.

Colombia reports and has for a number of years that the eradication efforts down there have been very good.

Coca in South America is questionable, however.

In Bolivia, if you take Blast Furnace into consideration, which is mostly an attack on laboratories, but you see that the secondary effect of that was to depress the price of coca leaves and in essence, attack the problem in that way and at least for a time, we had good results. The jury, however, is still out on that and we'll have to see what the long range results of that are going to be. It's going to take some time in order to break the dependence of people down there on the narco dollars that are produced by that type of drug traffic and for this they have a long term effect.

Mr. **Gilman**. Isn't it true, Mr. Trott, that we virtually have no eradication in Bolivia right now and we're talking about paying the farmers a subsidy in order for them to give up growing the coca and to then eradicate their crop—asking them to do it after a payment of a subsidy?

Mr. **Trott**. Well, that's—I suppose that's partially correct. The problem in Bolivia is, as you know there is a cultural acceptance of the coca leaf and it is not illegal to grow coca in certain areas because it is such a part of the culture.

Mr. **Gilman**. But, Mr. Trott, they were a signatory of a convention where it makes it illegal to grow above and beyond a certain amount and we're allowing for a certain amount of cultural use.

They are a signatory and it's illegal for them to grow it beyond a certain amount.

Mr. **Trott**. What I'm indicating is what you're indicating. There is a certain pocket down there that permits the growth.

Mr. **Rangel**. Your testimony infers, Mr. Trott, that there are other places outside of the pocket that they're enforcing laws against growing coca leaves and if there is, we don't know where it is.

In other words, the Ambassador from Bolivia to the United States told us that the legislative body will indeed make it illegal, conditional on a treaty, treaty heck, a grant that we give them to pay the farmers not to grow.

Mr. **Trott**. Let me refer you to Ecuador then.

Ecuador, as you know, is a base for coca cultivation in South America. We were notified that the government of Ecuador conducted four major eradication operations in '86 and officials estimate that coca cultivation has been reduced to about 1,000 hectares. Ecuador continues to work in the eradication arena to try to knock down these crops.

Peru is this side of the world's largest coca leaf cultivation network with annual production estimated about 95,000 to 120,000 metric tons. Since the inauguration of Alan Garcia in 1985, Peru has conducted five large scale enforcement operations in major growing areas, sought and discharged corrupt police and military officials and persisted in its coca eradication program.

By the end of—

Mr. **Rangel**. Mr. Trott, is there a footnote here that Peru has dramatically expanded the growth area and that they expect a 75,000 hectare increase in what's being produced notwithstanding the eradication?

Mr. **Trott**. I couldn't dispute that at all. You've simply asked me where they have had eradication efforts and I'm trying to go through them.

Mr. **Rangel**. Okay.

Mr. **Trott**. Mr. Chairman, in that respect, I can supply for you just as soon as it becomes finalized, the National Drug Policy Board Progress Report for '86, which is dated April and this is the source of my immediate information.

Mr. **Gilman**. Mr. Chairman, I'm being called to the floor on an amendment that I'm working on. I would like to add one footnote.

Mr. Trott, I'm frankly disappointed in some of the responses today as I have indicated and I would hope that the National Strategy Board is going to take a harder look at some of these more critical areas. We can't just afford to sit back and talk any more with our counterparts in these countries.

We have to try to get a more effective program and we are not able to get the kind of effective program we need to get to the heart of the problem and that's to get to the traffickers. We don't have a significant demand program here in the States at the present time and when we provided funds last year for starting a substantial demand program, the Administration or OMB came around and cut the heart out of that program.

Our enforcement people, Customs, the Coast Guard and the Border Patrol are out there trying to do the job, but what are we trying to do to get to the heart of the problem, to get to the trafficker, to try to do something about the demand you're talking about?

And we look to that National Strategy Board whose efforts you laud to come up with a more effective program. I hope you go back to that Board and try to bring about a program we can all be proud of.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

[Mr. Gilman's statement appears on p. 85.]

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Hughes, I want to thank you for the time that you've spent with the Select Committee. I know that as the Subcommittee Chairman on Crime and an active member of the Judiciary Committee, that the leadership that you provide for the Congress and share with us is deeply appreciated and the Chair recognizes you.

Mr. HUGHES. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I really have enjoyed my work on the Select Committee. You get into a lot of areas that I'm very interested in. Areas we don't take up in the subcommittee, including demand reduction and treatment which are extremely important aspects of the overall drug problem.

I have just a few questions, Mr. Chairman.

I know that Admiral Yost and Commissioner von Raab feel that they are veterans at this point, but I just have one question of the Commissioner.

Commissioner, how in the world can a person like Mickey Tolliver, if it's accurate, land at Homestead Air Force Base with a load of contraband and not have Customs nor government be aware of that?

Mr. VON RAAB. Tolliver is a known liar so I'm not certain that he did, but——

Mr. HUGHES. I understand. We know that there is some cooperation for that and there have been other incidents, as you know, and I wonder how it can occur?

Mr. VON RAAB. All right. The answer I am going to give you is one that is a hypothetical because I don't personally believe what he says took place.

But if an aircraft lands at a military base and it's a commercial airline and I assume we're not talking here about a military aircraft landing in a military base, but that it's not a military aircraft, there's a responsibility of the air base to secure that plane and to inform Customs of its arrival.

If the base did not take that action and Customs is not informed of the arrival of this plane, which by the way is not supposed to land there to start with because there are designated airports for commercial aircraft to land in, then the Customs Service will not necessarily inspect the plane because it would not have been made aware of its arrival.

Mr. HUGHES. Let me interrupt and give you a hypothetical because one of the things that lends some credibility in addition to some of the cooperation I've seen to what he says, is the fact that he had some CIA contacts. It's not the first time that individuals have said to Customs, we're working with CIA and then managed to bluff their way through situations at borders and ports of entry.

**Mr. von Raab.** Well, let us distinguish negligence on the part of the Customs officer, if that's the case, and proper procedure. I have discussed this issue with Bob Gates at the agency and it's quite clear to both of us that the practice always has been and by the way, we're looking at this within the Customs Service, that agencies flights do not have any sort of free pass into the United States. They are subject to the same inspection that the President's aircraft has when it returns.

As you well know, the President, and I'm sure you've been on these flights, is required to file a declaration——

**Mr. Hughes.** Very infrequently.

**Mr. von Raab.** Well, a Congressional delegation is required to file a declaration and the aircraft is subject to search. As a matter of fact, there is a rather famous incident of this early in my career in which the Secretary of Treasury himself was subject to a search as was his aircraft and Customs exercised its authority to do that.

I can assure you that if the Customs Service is encouraged to inspect the Secretary of the Treasury, it wouldn't think twice about inspecting an agency flight.

**Mr. Hughes.** But your answer basically is that you don't believe Tolliver is telling the truth and that basically is your answer.

**Mr. von Raab.** No, that's not my answer. I'm not naive enough to say that there couldn't be a situation in which, because of a failure to follow a proper procedure on the part of the man or woman at the air force base, that they failed to notify Customs that plane arrived.

But that's negligence if that's the case. It is not official policy. It's not even informal official policy I think that's what's important.

**Mr. Hughes.** Thank you.

Admiral Yost, I was informed that before I arrived that there was some discussion concerning missions, particularly with regard to interdiction. Coast Guard missions where their line of jurisdiction or demarcation begins and ends, particularly with regard to air interdiction and that's now before the Policy Board and will be decided in the near future.

Do I understand that correctly?

**Admiral Yost.** That's right, sir. The Policy Board has a requirement to prepare a full report for the President to sign and submit to Congress. I think the date of that report is the 12th of May and the report is to include areas of responsibility, lead agencies, that kind of thing.

**Mr. Hughes.** In South Florida are you able to talk with Customs on your communications systems now?

**Admiral Yost.** We've got an inter-operability problem throughout this nation——

**Mr. Hughes.** Which means the answer is no.

**Admiral Yost.** Well, not normally, but Customs has some radios that we normally carry aboard so that we can talk to them. In joint ops they'll carry aboard one of ours, so we work around the problem, but it isn't——

**Mr. Hughes.** Doesn't it present some serious operational problems?

**Admiral Yost.** Very serious.

Mr. von Raab. The Coast Guard will work with the Customs. I suppose that depends on how much funding the Coast Guard gets this year.

Admiral Yost. Well, we got in the Drug Omnibus Bill $11 million for communications that we're spending for communications and that will be part of it.

Inter-operability is a major concern. It's a major concern of the Policy Board. They've directed that the Department of Defense who is a member of the Policy Board, be a lead agency, so to speak, in working out this inter-operability.

Mr. Hughes. I understand.

Well, Mr. Chairman, I know you've been very concerned about funding for the U.S. Attorneys. We've had some conversation about that and we have a funding problem across the board. We're just operating in the margin and Mr. Gilman, before he left, indicated his frustration and we all share that frustration.

But the problem is, we have a resource problem. Even though we have increased significantly resources, we are absolutely overwhelmed and that's a major part of the problem. Sure we can continue to work and develop major strategy, but it's a resource problem.

I'm concerned about the problem with U.S. Attorneys and I know that you, Mr. Trott, understand very well that you can give dozens of new tools to the law enforcement community, new laws, dozens of new laws, step up our efforts and not attempt to deal with every aspect of the criminal justice system from U.S. Marshals to new judges to new U.S. Attorneys to new agents investigating borders and across the board and we haven't done a very good job of that.

And part of the problem, I think, is that the Justice Department apparently didn't make the case before the Committee that has jurisdiction over U.S. Attorneys.

Now, I'm looking for positions. Today we talked with the Executive Director of the United States Attorneys and he tells us that the authorized ceiling at present is 2,627. That presently, as of today, we have on board a total of 2,298—I'm sorry, 2,501 U.S. Attorneys on board now, 79 waiting to be sworn in and 156 awaiting background checks which would suggest to me that we're about 109 over the ceiling if they're all selected as U.S. Attorneys, and we have no further attrition which is unlikely, we'd be over the authorized ceiling.

I had a hard time today getting information as to exactly what we do need in resources for U.S. Attorneys. And as I indicated to the Chairman, we can't possibly deal with the problems unless we have some factual material on where we need U.S. Attorneys, where our shortfalls are and make the case before the authorizing Committee.

In the Judiciary Committee I expressed some concern about that method of funding and I'm prepared to work with others. I know Mr. Shaw shows a concern and others to try to keep at least that funding level if, in fact, we can ascertain and you can substantiate the need for additional U.S. Attorneys. I suspect you do need more U.S. Attorneys, but that's the problem. I understand that the case just wasn't made.

Mr. TROTT. Well, I agree with you completely, Mr. Congressman. The system has affected all across the line, from A to Z, whenever you increase resources in any particular area there's a need in other areas.

I believe we have made a persuasive case for assistant United States Attorneys. I talked with the Chairman about that before this meeting and we had indicated to him that we would provide him with additional information on the subject, but we can show you where we need additional U.S. Attorneys.

Mr. HUGHES. Well, Mr. Kastenmeier, who is the Chairman of the Courts Subcommittee within whose jurisdiction this falls, he's a fair and very honorable man. He didn't feel the case was made and he'd be the last one, in my judgment, to deny resources if he felt the case was made.

But be that as it may, there are a number of us who are uncomfortable with the present situation and we believe that there might be some imbalance. Okay.

Let me go to one other matter.

Every now and then a cockamania suggestion seems to arise once again in the Administration with regard to merging the FBI and DEA. I have traveled in different parts of the world and I have talked with a lot of host governments and when the concept first surfaced about 5 years ago, I had probably half a dozen people, high level officials in various countries, most of them Southeast Asia, tell me that if we began to mix missions such as intelligence, counter-intelligence missions in other countries with drug trafficking, we can forget foreign cooperation.

Now, I know that the Administrator, Jack Lawn, has been told the same thing frequently by heads of State and I'm concerned.

What is the present status of that proposal to merge, fully merge, and I think the use of the FBI resources have been productive at a time when we didn't have resources we needed. Obviously, we had to take them away from other missions, but it's been productive, but is there an active effort at the present time within the Administration to merge, fully merge, the FBI and DEA?

Mr. TROTT. No, the Attorney General announced just last week at the S.A.C. conference in Arizona that the proposal had been examined carefully and a decision had been made to keep DEA as a stand-alone agency however working in such ways between DEA and the FBI to produce economies of scale, training similarities and all the kinds of things that keep them working very closely together.

But that proposal, as you described it, to merge them completely, is dead.

Mr. HUGHES. Thank you.

At one time we had a commitment from the Attorney General which, in fact, surfaced again and it became a serious proposal that came before the Committees that have jurisdiction, and was submitted to the Congress. Is that still in position in the Administration?

Mr. TROTT. That's what the Attorney General said. You may wonder why we were looking at this, Congressman. At all times we examine our structure and our management lines and the way we're attacking the problem. If there were certain suggestions that we might be able to do a better job with a new structure and rather than simply say well, we won't even look at it, we gave it an in depth look because we are always open to better ways to do things, but after we looked at both sides of the equation and especially for one of the reasons that you underscored so strongly here today, we decided it would not be a good idea.

Mr. HUGHES. Well, I just think it would be absolutely stupid.

Mr. TROTT. Well, I don't think it would be stupid, but I don't think it would be a good idea.

Mr. HUGHES. Well, I can't think of a better way to destroy our foreign cooperative investigative program than merging the two. I think it's stupid.

Mr. TROTT. That was one of the main considerations. I agree.

Mr. HUGHES. Finally, a few years ago, the Drug Enforcement Administration came to our Committee and begged us to include in some anti-drug initiatives a new initiative to try to revitalize the diversion, the program dealing with the diversion of licit drugs into the illicit market.

At one time we had the Diversion Investigative Units, as you know, Mr. Chairman, and they were immensely successful on the State level. They were so successful in reducing the incidence of the diversion of prescription drugs into the illicit market, we destroyed the program, we zero funded it.

Since that time, we've had really no serious initiative. We have the capability today to identify in different regions of the country where we have major diversion problems. We have the capacity to move diversion investigative task forces into those areas and deal with the problem.

We funded that in the last Congress, for this fiscal year, to the tune of $2.7 million. It hasn't been spent. Why?

Mr. TROTT. I can't answer your question, that specific question. I can provide you with an answer for the record. But let me just tell you, with respect to domestic diversion investigations that I notified criminal diversion investigations, which involved the identification of high level violators, both practitioners and financiers backed by organized crime, about elements responsible for large scale diversion increased by over 7.5% between 1985, 328 investigations, and 1986, 353 investigations and I have significant——

Mr. HUGHES. Well, that doesn't tell me anything. That document tells me at one time we had 22 Diversion Investigative Units. We're down to 5 in this country.

Diversion, as you well know, is one of the most serious drug problems. It doesn't have the same sex appeal as trafficking in cocaine. It's not as sexy. It doesn't make as many headlines, but it creates more incidents in emergency rooms than the other drugs that we hear so much about and yet we really have a very modest, if not embarrassing diversion investigative program.

We can't blame Colombia on this problem. This problem is caused by bad doctors and bad pharmacists and people that are knocking off warehouses and shipments and as I've indicated, we have the capacity to do something about it and we're not doing anything seriously. As I say, this is one problem we can't blame on Colombia.

I mean if you want to measure how serious we are about dealing with the drug problem, look at diversion because we have no excuses with diversion.

Mr. TROTT. In the public interest revocation investigations which allowed DEA to deny an application for registration or suspend or revoke a registration, there's also been increased activity. In 1985, DEA denied or revoked 72 applications for registration. In 1986, there were 509 denials or revocations. Pre-registration investigations, which serve to assure that the authority to handle controlled substances is granted, only to those whose registration would be in the public interest increased from 1,276 in 1985 to 1,300 in 1986. Cyclic investigations which involve periodic unannounced investigations of manufacturers, distributors, importers and exporters to insure required controls are maintained increased by 27.8% between 1985, 500 in 1979——

Mr. HUGHES. 27% from what?

Mr. TROTT. Increase. From 579 to 740 in 1986.

Mr. HUGHES. But if it should be 2,000 active investigations that's like using a wet noodle to deal with the problem.

Mr. TROTT. Well, I have three pages of progress that I could submit to you for the record, Mr. Chairman and I will.

Mr. RANGEL. Thank you.

Mr. HUGHES. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Shaw.

Mr. SHAW. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I'll be brief. I have some questions that I want to ask with regard to the continuing problem that I'm hearing about as to coordination between Customs and the Coast Guard. I've gotten some information which was disturbing to me. However, because of the details that I'm in possession of, I'm a little concerned about making this known at a public hearing, so I would reserve the questions that I have with regard to that, it's the coordination of forces in South Florida, I will reserve that at a private meeting between the parties in order to try and seek out some more information.

But, we're continuing to see this problem of cooperation and coordination. Congressman Hughes raised the question again with regard to the radios. Unless there is active cooperation, I'm not sure that the agencies talking to each other is going to completely solve the problems that we're seeing. It almost appears to be an obsession with rivalry in some of these instances that have been called to my attention.

I would like to ask one specific question. We've been talking about these radios so long and when you say it was in the Omnibus Drug Bill, when are we going to get the radios? When are they going to be installed and when are they going to be working? When can we abandon this question with regard to the radios?

Admiral YOST. As I said, in the Drug Omnibus Bill there's $89 million in AC&I funding. That's capital investment. Of that, something over 10%, exactly $11 million, is being used to enhance communications. I'll have to provide for the record when that will be in, but it's an active contract. The contracting is being done, the delivery dates are not very far in the future. I just don't have the exact dates. It's something that's not over the horizon. We're on the verge of having that material in place.

Mr. **Shaw**. Well, I'm not going to burden you with having to look that up and provide it for the record, but I would like an idea as to the time sequence we're talking about.

Are we talking about within six months? Within a year?

Admiral **Yost**. We're talking about something within a year in my memory. Now, that may be the fiscal year. I don't have it with me, but it's not two years, it's under that and I don't remember the timeframe.

Delivered and operational, you can sign a contract, get delivery, put it in the vessel. That takes some time, but we're talking within the year as I remember.

Mr. **Shaw**. And you can get them in the vessels with that——

Admiral **Yost**. I think we can. Let me ask. We're talking about on the vessels within a year. Of course some of that year is going to be base stations, some of it high antenna sites, so it's going to be operational, parts of it within a year, all of it within two years. It's something right in front of us.

Mr. **Shaw**. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Admiral **Yost**. Are you going to meet with us? I'm very interested in any indication of non-cooperation. I have given my people direction that in Southeast Florida we're to do anything possible to make it work down there. I'm sure the Commissioner has done the same thing.

Mr. **Shaw**. My office is directly—up on the 4th floor of this building, so perhaps after this hearing, if you have a few minutes to drop by, I'd like to give you the information I have.

Admiral **Yost**. I'd love it, sir. I'll walk up with you.

Mr. **von Raab**. Congressman, I unfortunately have to catch a plane, but Mr. Rosenblatt, who is our Assistant Commissioner for Enforcement will certainly go to that meeting with you.

Mr. **Rangel**. Mr. Trott, can you tell us, what percentage of your time is dedicated to work on the National Drug Policy Board, roughly?

Mr. **Trott**. It's difficult to estimate. I can tell you for openers that not a day goes by when I don't spend a significant chunk of that day on drug matters and on the National Drug Enforcement Policy Board coordinating——

Mr. **Rangel**. Maybe if I—the reason for my question might help you with your answer. We in the Congress would like at some point to be able to grab somebody that will have answers about all of the questions that we have concerns with. It's abundantly clear that as it relates to this National Policy Board, that we have not yet been able to identify that person.

While there appears to be a building political demand in the Senate for a so-called Czar, I have resisted the temptation to join in that call. The Czar I guess they mean is someone that has a full time responsibility to report to the American people as to what we are trying to do in the area of concern of this Committee. So, you know, the old prosecutor thing I used to do—so would you say half of your time is devoted to national policy work?

Mr. **Trott**. No, I would say between—roughly in the area of 20 percent, but what we do have is an assistant to the Attorney General now who does nothing but work on——

Mr. **Rangel**. What's his name?

Mr. TROTT. Mr. Coy. He is more of a facilitator and an administrative type than a policy person, but he works on it 100 percent of his time for the Attorney General, plus we have the Policy Board staff with people detailed from agencies and that staff works on it 100 percent of the time.

Mr. RANGEL. What I'm searching for, Mr. Trott, is somebody that if you picked up the phone and called the Admiral and called the Commissioner, that they would know that the President has a concern, I mean someone that would call and they would know that this is a part of our national mandate and I'm certainly not talking about staffers who work full time.

If you put in 20 percent of your time and knew that you made up half of the Drug Policy Board—I'm not going to ask you how much time does the Attorney General expend on the Policy Board. You're designated by him.

Mr. TROTT. He spends a considerable part of his time——

Mr. RANGEL. Listen, we all do. We all do. We all spend a considerable amount, but you're not helping me. I'm trying to say this, that there's nobody that's an American that has any job that they don't spend a considerable amount of their time concerned about. The problem is just that we in the Congress have to respond to you people and would like to know when we have concerns who we can ask the questions to that have some knowledge.

Now, if we're talking about considerable time, I assume that the Secretary of State spends considerable time. I've heard no major statement from him, but——

Mr. TROTT. In my view it would be of no value at all to create an encyclopedia-like single individual with all the answers to everything. It is much more effective and it is much more valuable and much more important to have an Admiral of the Coast Guard, which we have here, who can tell you anything you want to know about the Coast Guard's operation, to have a Commissioner of Customs who can tell you anything you want to know about the Customs operations, to have an Assistant Secretary of State for International Narcotics Matters who can answer all your questions, to have an FBI person and a DEA person and an IRS person——

Mr. RANGEL. Can you tell me why we have a special adviser to the President on narcotic matters? What is that job description?

Mr. TROTT. I refer you to him and he can give it to you.

Mr. RANGEL. You know you've been doing a lot of referring today and we don't need you to get in touch with these people. We can subpoena them, we can request their appearance and the only reason I'm asking you is not to embarrass you, but because you have this title as Coordinator——

Mr. TROTT. And that's exactly what I am.

Mr. RANGEL [continuing]. Because of your relationship to the man in charge who's the Attorney General, who spends considerable time and you want to talk about the effectiveness of these people and you should not have to carry this heavy burden, but obviously you're willing to assume the responsibility.

If you want to talk about the effectiveness when you talk about production and out of sorts and I'm not trying to flatter the people sitting around you, it's just that we just don't think that interdiction is going to play any major part in our lifetime in reducing the available drugs on the street. We would like to have them there, it's a deterrent and do the best he can, but if we're demanding and they're producing, I think it's safe to say you can interrupt me if I am wrong or can differ because it's clear to me that you know more than me on this subject——

Mr. TROTT. I will interrupt because I think——

Mr. RANGEL. Do you really think that von Raab can protect our borders and keep this stuff from coming in?

Mr. TROTT. We believe that Mr. von Raab is doing a good job. We believe that the Coast Guard is doing a good job. We believe there's a hell of a lot of room for improvement and we're dedicated to making that——

Mr. RANGEL. You must have misunderstood me. I think they're doing a fantastic job and I don't think it depreciates one ounce the amount of cocaine that's still on our streets. Do you differ with me?

Mr. TROTT. I think it does depreciate. I think——

Mr. RANGEL. How much? What percentage would it depreciate, the fantastic great job that they're doing with the tons of drugs that are coming in and being produced? What do you think they're stopping?

Mr. TROTT. I'm convinced that when we get up, for example, the full Operation Alliance Program along the Southwest border that we will immediately and significantly—and I'm not going to give you percentages because nobody knows how many guns are coming across our borders, nobody for openers. So we're dealing with an unknown figure.

Mr. RANGEL. How much do you think is being produced of cocaine and heroin in the world today?

Mr. TROTT. Tons.

Mr. RANGEL. Tons. And how much do you think when you get up to full strength, whenever that is, is going to reach the United States? Answer? Time?

Mr. TROTT. Significant percentages of——

Mr. RANGEL. Of tons.

Mr. TROTT. Absolutely.

Mr. RANGEL. And so it would be less tonnage coming in than before.

Mr. TROTT. Yes, I suppose.

Mr. RANGEL. So what's the difference how many tons come into our—you're going to tell me that instead of 200 tons coming in that they're going to have only 170 tons coming in?

You don't expect that interdiction is going to make any difference if 170 tons are coming in instead of 200 or say if you just want to—say they cut it in half, which is impossible, so 100 tons come in.

Mr. TROTT. That's 100 tons of cocaine that kids did not use and I'm proud of that if we're able to achieve it.

Mr. RANGEL. Well, I'll tell you one thing——

Mr. TROTT. Every time that we stop one——

Mr. RANGEL. It's a good thing. Let's be proud of what we're doing, but the truth of the matter is that if you really want to get a handle on the program, we have to deal with the man and we have to deal with source and whatever they're doing, God bless them for doing it. They're doing a fantastic job.

Mr. TROTT. We agree.

Mr. **Rangel**. A great job. We agree.

Mr. **Trott**. And we have to continue to do even a better job in the area of interdiction and we believe that interdiction as a concept should share a full chunk of the partnership in stopping drug trafficking.

Mr. **Rangel**. Okay. Whatever you said about the Coast Guard and Customs, you guys believe in and you're doing a fantastic job.

Now, production. We are doing a lousy job in convincing the producers With all the agreements that we have, with all of the aids and subsidies, with all of the crop substitution programs, you would agree that as relates to heroin and cocaine that in every country, barring perhaps Ecuador, that they have bumper crops. Wrobleski told me that.

Mr. **Trott**. Whatever you want to describe it as, any crop is too much.

Mr. **Rangel**. Well, I'll describe it as more than they had last year and that each year it increases.

I'm saying I don't think there's a bumper crop when cocaine and heroin——

Mr. **Trott**. I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman, I didn't hear that.

Mr. **Rangel**. Okay. Well, I'm saying that cocaine and heroin, I think we're getting bumper crops of marijuana in California, but I'm saying cocaine and marijuana—strike it out—and heroin, in each case that you cited that we have agreements, We expect that there will be more produced in 1988 than in 1987, 1987 than 1986, and each Administration produces more than the previous Administration and they have more agreements in each Administration and more cooperation in each Administration.

But the fact is that we expect that more will be pointed towards the United States this year than last year. Isn't that so?

Mr. **Trott**. I couldn't dispute that.

Mr. **Rangel**. Okay. And we've taken care of interdiction.

Mr. **Trott**. Although it's also clear to us that more is also targeted for other areas of the world as the cocaine market spreads around the globe.

Mr. **Rangel**. That's not a very helpful thought, but I won't dispute that either.

Mr. **Trott**. It's very discouraging.

Mr. **Rangel**. Now that we've taken care of production as a crisis and interdiction as a holding action, you really didn't mean to say that you thought that law enforcement was a demand reduction factor.

Mr. **Trott**. Oh, absolutely in drug testing. Absolutely. I'll tell you how I think we got into this problem.

Do you want my 25 cents worth on this one?

Mr. **Rangel**. Well, of course, you have attached a value to it so——

Mr. **Trott**. And I absolutely mean that. I'm not a sociologist, but I've been involved in law enforcement now since 1965. When I was a prosecutor in 1965, we used to prosecute people who possessed and used drugs. They were brought into Superior Court in California and prosecuted for a felony and compared to the drug problem that we had then, the drug problem now is Niagara Falls and I believe that the word out there was that the laws against drug use and possession had consequences and slowly as I watched, we began to change our attitude in the United States about drugs.

We started talking about them in all kinds of terms and almost overnight in the 1960s, we went from prosecuting drug possession and drug use cases to not prosecuting drug possession and drug use cases and in California, and in most of the other states across the country, we went into something called diversion which meant if you got picked up by the police for possession of any kind of drug, cocaine, marijuana, heroin, we sent you instead to a high school six times in two months where somebody said don't use drugs, this could not be good for you.

If you completed successfully some nickel and dime diversion program, we brought you back to court, we wiped out your arrest record and we let you go and by taking the teeth, the consequences, out of law enforcement, we let everybody in the United States know that this law is not enforced, forget it.

And I ascribe a significant part of our problem to law enforcement vis-a-vis the area of the user, so that's what I mean in terms of law enforcement having to do with the demand side of the equation. A lot of people will continue to use it whether it is legal or not, but a lot of people, who recognize that if you can get in trouble with the law, won't.

I believe that our laws that prohibit the use and possession once again have to be revitalized and those laws have to contain consequences. I'm not suggesting that the consequences should necessarily involve throwing all users and all people who possess into jail because unfortunately, we don't have the jail space for that, but we ought to start looking at other things like large fines, like restrictions on drivers' licenses, like taking away your opportunity to spend your summer at the beach and instead putting you down at the American Way doing some socially useful purpose.

There are any number of other consequences that we can write back in these laws and I think we would make a tremendous move against the demand side of the equation by re-establishing the proposition that use and possession is against the law and that's still something in the United States that we haven't come to closure on.

Mr. Rangel. Mr. Trott, you may be preaching to the converted highest prosecute cases in the Southern District of New York where we had mandatory sentences and we used to have then Federal narcotic officers in the street—would you believe that——

Mr. Trott. Sure.

Mr. Rangel [continuing]. Doing undercover work which of course now the Justice Department believes that you deal now with high level conspiracy, but we don't mind a U.S. Attorney, when he is going to take narcotic cases, he has a press conference. And you know what I think, I think he takes actually drug pushing cases from the local District Attorney's office on the first Monday.

Mr. Trott. Federal Day.

Mr. Rangel. Federal Day. And I get out there and thank the United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York for enforcing the federal law. You're telling me that's going to reduce the demand?

Let me ask you this.

Mr. Trott. No.

Mr. Rangel. If you believe that law enforcement is going to reduce demand, how many drug enforcement agents do we have that's going to reduce demand?

Mr. Trott. It's also going to reduce demand by keeping drugs away from schools and making it harder to get.

Mr. Rangel. How many Federal drug enforcement agents do we have?

Mr. Trott. Well, this is the point and that is the Federal government's resources deployed against this problem are very limited and the States have to start to do an even better job in picking up their side of the equation.

Mr. Rangel. Terrific. Now that we've taken care of production and interdiction, you have now said that as relates to law enforcement when you're dealing with these foreigners that talk about a demand reduction level, law enforcement could really be a very, very important and vital tool in decreasing demand. Unfortunately, we don't have the resource.

Mr. Trott. No, I said the resources are there, but they have to be deployed effectively.

Mr. Rangel. But they are not being employed effectively.

Mr. Trott. No, they are. Federal resources have to continue to be deployed against major trafficking organizations in terms of what the FBI and DEA does. The new national FBI drug strategy, for example, targets major distributing organizations that operate internationally and are beyond the reach of State and local law enforcement. Then we have to rely on task forces and State and local police officers.

Mr. Rangel. And in this area, you believe that we should principally believe that local and State law enforcement officers should not receive any Federal dollars in this effort.

Mr. Trott. What I believe is the Federal dollars are to be spent in the Federal effort and States can certainly do their part in resourcing their own police departments.

Mr. Rangel. Did you contradict anything I said? I mean, you say it more eloquently, but you don't—what I said was that you believe that as relates to law enforcement by the State and local law enforcement agencies that they should not receive one red penny of Federal money.

Mr. Trott. Well, I'm not sure I'm able to say one red penny, maybe three or four.

Mr. Rangel. Did you ever tell me how many Federal agents we have dealing with drugs?

Mr. Trott. I'm not sure of the figure. We have 1,000 FBI agents, actually it's probably more.

Mr. Rangel. That's how many we have in New York City taking care of narcotics.

Mr. Trott. In terms of man years, DEA——

Mr. Rangel. Okay. I think——

Mr. Trott. 3,500. Customs, a couple of hundred.

Mr. Rangel. Okay, so the whole—couple of thousand or 5,000? That's our Federal law enforcement effort.

Mr. Trott. How about United States Attorneys and if you added prisons——

Mr. RANGEL. U.S. Attorneys I'm talking about English. I'm talking about making cases. I'm talking about out there.

Mr. TROTT. It's short of 10,000, in that area.

Mr. RANGEL. All right. So that's our Federal effort. So much for reducing demand because, you know, like I said, we're really locking them up, we're not reducing demand. Demand's exploding in my district and the districts around the country and we don't share with you the deterrent in this area, but I'd like to——

Mr. TROTT. How about drug testing? How about drug testing? That's part of our program too.

Mr. RANGEL. Whose program?

Mr. TROTT. The Federal government program. We use drug testing as a demand reducer.

Mr. RANGEL. Well, where have you proven that it works?

Mr. TROTT. The military has reduced drug use by 67%.

Mr. RANGEL. You've got a job and you do what you're told, but you surrender certain citizens rights because you're part of the military. No problem, they're doing a fantastic job.

Mr. TROTT. Drug testing, we think, could be effective also.

Mr. RANGEL. What about the courts? Would they be involved in this at all in your thinking?

Courts decision as to where you can drug test and——

Mr. TROTT. Well, sure, they will be. There's no doubt about it.

Mr. RANGEL. They haven't been very cooperative in this effort, have they?

Mr. TROTT. Well, they are now. We just won a major case involving the Customs Service in the Court of Appeals.

Mr. RANGEL. Okay. Where I wanted to end up is on the education and wrap this thing up because we're losing ground in production, we're losing ground in interdiction.

Do I have to continue to say you guys are doing a great job. We're losing ground. More is coming in than last year.

I want the record to indicate Mr. Trott's views on law enforcement and demand reduction. I'll ask staff to prepare some papers for me to send more questions to give him ample opportunity to explore this idea. I think you've got to be getting involved in a lot of personal feelings as to what could be done as opposed to what has been done, but in the area of demand reduction by education, is it your testimony that you know of no formal Federal program coming out of the Department of Education to reduce demand?

Mr. TROTT. Mr. Chairman, I'm going to not answer, with your permission, that question and refer you to the Secretary of Education.

Mr. RANGEL. Okay. Then let me ask you as the Drug Coordinator for the United States and the free world——

Mr. TROTT. Law enforcement side.

Mr. RANGEL. Law enforcement side and associate to the Attorney General who's in charge of the whole thing, and special adviser to the President, do you know of any national drug rehabilitation program which has a lot to be in demand, you know, when you just say no, you're already abused and you pick up the hotline and you call and say help, what do you tell Americans and foreigners or members of Congress that the Federal government is doing to create a national program for rehab?

Mr. Trott. I refer you to Dr. Macdonald.

Mr. Rangel. Good. Now, how long has Dr. Macdonald been on board here?

Mr. Trott. A couple, three months.

Mr. Rangel. He's your equal, right?

Mr. Trott. In the coordinating group area, yes. He handles the other coordinating group and he's now taken Carlton Turner's job as you know.

Mr. Rangel. That doesn't help. What was Carlton Turner's job?

Mr. Trott. Well, he handled the White House Office of Drug Abuse Policy and was the adviser to the President.

Mr. Rangel. Well, I know that the adviser to the President—what kind of advice he would give him, but how does he relate to what you people are doing? I mean if the President has the ear of Dr. Macdonald or is that an embarrassing question?

Does the President ever see Dr. Macdonald? It's not funny. He never saw Turner. Does he see Dr. Macdonald or if he wanted to get to the President right away would you be able to call Dr. Macdonald and tell him this is our advice to the President or do you use him as a conduit for information to the President?

Mr. Trott. I don't. I use the Attorney General.

Mr. Rangel. Do you know of anybody that uses Dr. Macdonald to get to the President?

Mr. Trott. That doesn't mean it doesn't exist. I just don't know how often he meets with him.

Mr. Rangel. You know, I don't get along with too many Republicans in the House, but I talk with them. I know what the devil is going on and it just seems to me that what you are saying is that it's not in your shop. What about—you referred us to Ms. Wrobleski or better still, the Assistant Secretary of State in charge of International Narcotic Matters. Now, isn't she in your shop? Doesn't she report directly to you?

Mr. Trott. She works for the State Department. She's a member of the Coordinating Group and the State Department is a member of the Policy Board.

Mr. Rangel. But don't you coordinate what they are trying to do as it relates say to extradition treaties? Wouldn't that——

Mr. Trott. Absolutely.

Mr. Rangel. And when it relates to eradication programs?

Mr. Trott. Yes.

Mr. Rangel. And so when we ask you, you know, just where we are on extradition and eradication programs, you would believe that we shouldn't ask you, that we should ask——

Mr. Trott. Oh, no, I told you we would supply you with the information for the record on all the extradition treaties and mutual legal assistance treaties that we have worked on since 1980.

Had you asked me before I appeared today that question, I would have come up here with the memo which is in my office. I just don't bother to cram that information in my head, but I have it in my office. The letter that you have sent to me has nothing to do—didn't ask me that question.

Mr. Rangel. It wasn't information that I think you should cram. It just hurts my heart to believe that we're going to have to, as taxpayers, pay all this money to Bolivia and not have the slightest idea as to what the program is or what it's about.

Mr. TROTT. That's not accurate at all. The State Department can provide you in minute detail the aspects of that program.

Mr. RANGEL. Why do we need the Coordinating Board then if not to report to the Congress or to the American people? This is just your way to——

Mr. TROTT. Had you asked me to come up here with the information, I would have gotten the information together and given it to you.

Mr. RANGEL. I don't need to ask you. I could have gotten the Assistant Secretary of State.

Mr. TROTT. And that's exactly who you should get.

Mr. Chairman, I think we've not made it clear to you what the function of the Coordinating Group is. The Coordinating Group is not an agency that has an existence outside of the other agencies. The Coordinating Group is a coordinating group involving inter-agency matters. What we do is we bring together monthly agency heads and people responsible for programs and facilitate the construction of inter-agency programs to tackle these matters.

We do not run command and control authority these agencies. This is a Cabinet form of government. We bring together departments and we fashion responses. I have told the members of this agency—the agencies over and over and over again that I am not going to come up here and answer for them.

I will tell you what we are doing to coordinate, but a State Department program should be addressed by the State Department. A Coast Guard program, should be addressed by the Coast Guard.

Mr. RANGEL. How can you come up here when you don't know what the policy is?

Mr. TROTT. I know what the policy is.

Mr. RANGEL. You have no idea what our policy is in extradition as to whether or not we have anything going in Colombia. You didn't know what—

Mr. TROTT. That's not true at all. I was interrupted about seven times while I was trying to run through the history of our policy.

Mr. RANGEL. No, we know the history. We've been in Colombia almost every year.

Mr. TROTT. I don't know what the President of Colombia told you three days ago because if you had asked me exactly where we are in Colombia I could have some up here, because I have the memos in my office, and given you the cases on which extradition has been successful, the cases on which extradition has been denied and the cases on which extradition has been pending and I could show you the cases related to the new efforts made by the same President you referred to to create the new judiciary down there that can cope with the problems.

Mr. RANGEL. We have not returned from there, Mr. Trott, three days ago. It's been how long now? It's been a month ago and we were really asking for information not trying to tell you. It was the President who said that no one could be extradited from Colombia who told us that a month ago.

I was asking whether or not or Ben Gilman was, whether there had been any changes. It's been over a month ago that the Colombian government and a month ago that the President said that there was no drug trafficking cases being tried in the military or in the civilian court. You contested this when Mr. Hughes asked it, but you didn't have any information to rebut it.

Now, if it's true, you know, how would you feel? How would you direct? If you don't have anything to do with what they do, why do they need a coordinator if they just establish their own policies? What do you bring to the table for them?

Mr. TROTT. Well, I'll give you an example of what we do. Operation Alliance is a good example. Quite a long time ago, we perceived, meaning all the agencies in the Federal government, that there was a significant problem along the Soutwest border and it had to be addressed on a problematic basis by a lot of different agencies.

So when Lowell Jensen was the Chairman of the Coordinating Group he established a Southwest border subcommittee and established the name Frank Keating, the Assistant Secretary of the Treasury for operations and at that time enforcement, to be the chair person of the Southwest border subcommittee. The Southwest border subcommittee then brought in the Customs Service and DEA, IRS, FBI, all the players, Border Patrol and put together working with the military, a comprehensive inter-agency program to address the Southwest border. And you know what that program involves and I've got all the statistics——

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Trott, you're not answering my question.

Mr. TROTT. You say I'm not answering your questions and you've interrupted every one of my answers.

Mr. RANGEL. Every time I interrupt, Mr. Trott, is only because I'm supporting what you're saying and in the area of task force, there is no question in my mind that the coordination has been superb and in all of the cases I know of, the operations have been successful. So when you say I am interrupting you, I was just trying to save your time in trying to frame the question more precisely so that when I asked what the Coordinating Board really does, I really mean what are you doing as it relates to a national federal policy as it relates to production, interdiction, demand reduction, education and law enforcement, not——

Mr. TROTT. I'm trying to give you an example of what we've done in interdiction. You don't like me to be broad, so I'm going to be specific and it's going to take me a half an hour and I'd like you to sit here for a half an hour while I walk you through what the Coordinating Group has done in Operation Alliance.

In the first instance, the Coordinating Group——

Mr. RANGEL. That's one way to bring this to a shrieking halt. If you're telling me that it takes you thirty minutes to outline what you think the Coordinating Group is doing, then perhaps I'll read the book that you have presented to this Committee.

Mr. TROTT. I submitted that for the record, but let me——

Mr. RANGEL. You submitted it for the record and——

Mr. TROTT. You asked me this question, Mr. Chairman and you're creating a false impression that the Coordinating Group does nothing and what I'd like to do is answer your question.

First of all, we conceived of this as a concept. We put together the agencies, we established a chairman and we told the agencies sit down and figure out a program to do something about this and we did. We've used substantial resources all across the border. We now have State and local people who are going to be putting up aerostat balloons. We have E-2Cs patrolling the border. We have 60 additional prosecutors down there. We have now subcommittees of the Coordinating Group working on the impact of this on prisons, the impact of this on marshals, the impact of this on the judiciary and it is the Coordinating Group that facilitated the cross designation.

As you heard earlier, Customs has now cross designated Border Patrol agents agents between ports of entry and Customs authority. DEA has cross designated Customs people and they're all involved in this, so there's a sharing of the legal jurisdiction that's necessary to put up a comprehensive program.

We have a Mr. Rosenblatt helping and we have a statistical profile that's up and running so that we will be able to give you the exact results of this and this is what the Coordinating Group does. We will have a report every month on Operation Alliance and I will ask Frank Keating or Mr. Lawn from DEA or whomever or Alan Nelson from INS what are the problems that you are having.

He will identify the problems and then we will either establish a working group or subcommittee of the Coordinating Board to get rid of them. But I will say it seems to me that we need a purely articulated word for State and local people. What should that be? If DEA and Customs would come up with a purely articulated word for State and local people. In this case they modeled it after the highly successful San Diego Task Force which is a multi-agency task force in the corridor approach and that has now been implemented all across the border and we are out there teaching people what to do.

Now what else do I do. I go down to Glynco which is a Federal training center. Down there there's Operation Alliance training that's going on. We have specific Alliance training that's going on so that our Federal agents will be able to play a part in this program. And this—I'm trying to capsulize it and put it all together, but this is what the Coordinating Group does.

We have another situation, for example. Panama is the fourth largest banking center of the world. Panama is also a bank secrecy jurisdiction. For two years, we've been trying to find a way to create in Panama new laws that would enable us to get financial information, tactical and otherwise out of them to use against drug traffickers. We also have Customs agreements with Panama, so we have the possibility that there may be a cross up there between the Customs agreement and a bilateral failure of information policy to establish a subcommittee with Bill Welch and Frank Keating asking them to sit down and figure out a way to put together our interests.

We're now about to go down to Panama. We've done that and that's another thing that the Coordinating Group does. I can pick out about 50 or 60 areas that we've tackled as a Coordinating Group to approach this problem.

Mr. RANGEL. I do not have any problem with what I thought the National Policy Group was supposed to do and it's clear to me that each agency decides what contribution they can make in this effort.

Mr. Trott. No, that's not accurate either.

Mr. Rangel. Who's in charge of determining the national policy?

Mr. Trott. Here it is. If they agree——

Mr. Rangel. Who's in charge of that? The Attorney General——

Mr. Trott. The National Drug Enforcement Policy Board produced this through the Coordinating Group. Each agency had an opportunity to add its views as to what the strategy ought to be. Then this document is produced and I and the Coordinating Group then come up with an implementation idea. The DOD authorization language requires us to by May 12th to come up with an interdiction program. We're taking that as an opportunity to get moving.

Hopefully we'll be designating root agencies for every function that's involved in the drug war from education to law enforcement. We will articulate clearly what the definition of a root agency is and we will set up supporting or secondary agencies and we will create in each area a specific wall that opens up with a strategy——

Mr. Rangel. Who is the person in the United States of America that is the spokesman for this national and indeed international strategy?

Mr. Trott. Well, if there is a spokesman, the person who heads the Policy Board is the Attorney General.

Mr. Rangel. But you don't know whether there is a spokesman.

Mr. Trott. Well, you know, the executive order doesn't say the spokesman shall be the Attorney General, but it's implicit that the Attorney General is the Chairman of this with the Vice Chairman of Otis Bowen to deal with educational things and the Coordinating Group people can speak for the process.

However, we hope that the agencies, which are very capable, will continue to be able to speak for themselves.

Mr. Rangel. They've been doing that administration after administration. We don't have any problem with the agencies determining what they think is in the national interest.

Mr. Trott. Agencies don't go off by themselves any more and decide what they want to do. They think about the overall program and they work the strategy and they talk to each other. That's the major difference as compared to eight years ago.

Mr. Rangel. But in terms of enunciating what our national and foreign policy strategy is in fighting this war against drugs, we could not identify really the national person that the President would depend on to be able to go around the country and indeed the world and say what that policy is.

Mr. Trott. Mr. Rangel, it's the Attorney General and he does that frequently and this is—the Policy Board comes up with policy. All right? The Coordinating Group and the agencies then work in ways to turn this policy into strategy and then the agencies work together to implement.

Mr. Rangel. You said if there was a spokesman it would be—now you're saying that the national spokesman for the President of the United States, as it relates to our effort to fight this drug epidemic is Edward Meese, the Attorney General of the United States. I just want you to say it.

Mr. **Trott**. But there has to be a larger understanding than that.

Mr. **Rangel**. Okay.

Mr. **Trott**. And that's this, and that is, that the Cabinet form of government continues to exist and the Secretary of State has a significant role in this as has the Secretary of Defense and all the other players in the individual agencies.

This is not a Justice Department operation and that's the only footnote that I want to tag this. This is an Administration effort that the Attorney General, on behalf of the President, sits at the top of the Policy Board pyramid.

Mr. **Rangel**. You flatter yourself that you think that I thought it was a Department of Justice operation really. I assume that the only reason the Attorney General was selected was because of the President's confidence in him and the fact that he was Attorney General and that his influence goes far beyond the Justice Department.

My only problem is whether or not the Attorney General, with all of the things that his expertise demands his attention to, has enough time to devote to this very serious problem.

Mr. **Trott**. Yes, he does, Mr. Chairman, because drug trafficking has been our number one law enforcement priority since the law enforcement coordinating committees saw the problem in early 1982. It's been that way for the entire time and the Attorney General spends more of his time by a large portion on drug trafficking and on Policy Board matters than on any other issue, really, as do I.

The last time the Attorney General had a press conference to announce the accomplishments of the Policy Board and the strategy, we had a number of people come, but the coverage wasn't that great. Don't ask me why. I guess we should have had dancing nude individuals or something. But the Attorney General has been out there over and over and over again and it's virtually—the media seems more interested in dwelling on that part of the donut that's not there rather than the part that is.

Mr. **Rangel**. Well, is that the independence of the Cabinet officers held so sacred by the Administration.

Mr. **Trott**. And that is true.

Mr. **Rangel**. I know.

When last do you remember the Secretary of State and the Executor of the President's foreign policy holding a press conference as relates to extradition, eradication, production, any major address that he's given?

Mr. **Trott**. No. If you look in the record, you asked me that question the last time I was here and I will tell you again that the President, through the Secretary of State, asked that all Ambassadors be brought back to Washington last fall in order to examine what our international progam was. All the Ambassadors came back and I'll tell you again that the Secretary of State George Shultz, on behalf of the President, gave one of the best speeches to the Ambassadors on drug trafficking, where the President was and where this Administration was and a pep talk in terms of how much time and devotion and energy they ought to spend on this that I've ever heard.

And there were public statements. That was made public, that was announced and the Secretary of State spoke out at that time.

Mr. **Rangel**. I interrupted you. You were going to tell me about the great speech he gave the Ambassadors when I interrupted. How did you conclude that?

Mr. **Trott**. That was a matter of public record.

Mr. **Rangel**. The speech he gave to the Ambassadors, to our Ambassadors?

Mr. **Trott**. I remember that there were also public releases about that. The Secretary of State has spoken out on this a number of times. He spoke out on it during the Camarena investigation and I'm told that next Monday, Secretary Shultz will give a keynote address to a conference on International Narcotics Conferral with the State Department.

Mr. **Rangel**. Address to whom?

Mr. Trott. We'll provide that information for you. I only have that it was a——

Mr. **Rangel**. You know, it never entered my mind that you guys weren't talking to each other, so that's not what I'm talking about. I assume the Attorney General speaks out to you and to the Secretary of State and that Bennett talks to you.

I'm talking about the independence—Caspar Weinberger, I assume that this is a front line concern security problem, because the President said it's a national security problem, but I assume that he tells you people what he's doing in this area.

Mr. **Trott**. He has a three star general that's not under the Coordinating Group whose job it is to make sure that the military is a full partner in this program, General Olmstead.

Mr. **Rangel**. I had a very good meeting with him yesterday in my office.

I'm asking since these people are so independent because of the respect for the Cabinet position, when last have you heard the Secretary of Defense speak out against this threat to our national security?

You see, I see them often on television, terrorism, communism, and I know they're outspoken and I'm just asking since we should not depend on the Attorney General to do this because of his mutual respect for his brothers in the Cabinet——

Mr. **Trott**. That's not what I said either. I didn't say you can't depend on the Attorney General to do this. The Attorney General speaks out against drug trafficking every day in the week.

Mr. **Rangel**. I know—

Mr. **Trott**. I added a footnote that he also respects all other Cabinet Secretaries in their special missions against drug trafficking.

Mr. **Rangel**. Then why don't they speak out on their special missions?

Mr. **Trott**. They do. I've heard Caspar Weinberger speak out many times. He's very proud of what the military is able to do in terms of reducing drug use.

Mr. **Rangel**. Could you do me a favor then? Maybe we can end all of this. Could you kind of get together with those people on your Coordinating Board and get these speeches and the dates of these speeches because the press is really doing a non-service to these people.

I've heard Secretary Bennett speak out every other week on kicking these kids out of school, so I know he gets a chance to talk about what the colleges should be doing and what the high schools should be doing and the need for respect and discipline in the elementary and junior high schools, so I know he speaks out.

I've never heard him talk about a Federal program, but I have heard him speak out about what he thinks the school system should be doing. I don't have any argument with him in what he believes, but do you know of any Federal program that you ever heard him speak out, outside of the Coordinating Board, of some Federal program that we're supporting to reduce demand?

Mr. **Trott**. Secretary Bennett? The only thing I can do is refer that to his people and get the information from them.

Mr. **Rangel**. Okay. Let me tell you that we have some different opinions I guess in the Congress as to what we expect. Perhaps we should not expect more from the Coordinating Policy Board than what you are doing and we don't take issue with what you are doing.

We do believe that we should find somewhere a person, special assistant—special adviser to the President for narcotic affairs or a person that reports to the President on a full time basis to be able not only to serve as a traffic cop and resolve differences between the line agencies, but someone that could say that the President of the United States and the Commander in Chief has very definite views that he expects his Cabinet officials as well as members of Congress to support and this is the effort and we want friend and foe alike, countries that are cooperating can depend on benefits. Those that are not, can depend on the wrath and sanctions to come from, not the Congress, but from the United States.

It's clear that this type of lack of communication has caused some problems perhaps even in the trade agreements and we're going through this exchange and difference of views, but I do hope that we can find someone. Perhaps it's Dr. Macdonald as the special adviser to the President, that might be able to be the expert who is knowledgeable about everything that everyone is doing and can report to the American people and the Congress as to what's going on.

We've asked this of every Administration, not just this one and the Congress has been disappointed that each one points at the other one and sometimes it seems like a firing squad that has been formed in a circle, but everyone respects the integrity of each office. We're not trying to take anything away from your Constitutional responsibilities, but we don't see any light at the end of the tunnel.

Nothing is happening with demand. Nothing is happening except bad news in production and we've got our fingers in a hole in the dike. The Congress is going to continue to do what we think is in the national interest. We hope, Mr. Trott, that you might tell your colleagues in the Administration that even if they disagree with what we think is in the national interest, that they might try to cooperate with us a little more in terms of what they think would be the better of what may be considered as bad plans.

I'm suggesting in the areas of education. Secretary Bennett believes that there's no need to get involved in that with appropriated money. We hope that the Coordinating Board might say that we are to develop some Federal guidelines and programs.

In local and State law enforcement I know how strongly the Attorney General feels that where the community benefits in law enforcement, they should pay for it. We have appropriated money. We're going to appropriate more. It would seem to me that once you know that's going to happen and once you know that it's going to be veto-proof that you might come up with some ways that the money can most effectively be used in cooperation with the Federal government rather than just——

Mr. TROTT. Mr. Chairman, we've done that with the first set of grant money and we will continue to do that although we believe that—you see, Congressman Hughes pointed out that we need resources everywhere. We need Marshals, we need Customs agents, we need IRS people, FBI, DEA, courts, we need a lot of additional Federal resources.

For every $250 million that goes to the State and local, that's in our view $250 million that probably could have been spent to help the Federal effort.

Mr. RANGEL. That's just not so, there's no reason for you to take that attitude. No one has been advocates more in helping local and State government and this Committee has supported every request that has come to us as a Committee in order to enhance the capabilities of the——

Mr. TROTT. My only point is that if you give us some drug money to administer in some respect, we would continue to do it as we have and we always look for ways to use that money to the best advantage against drug traffickers in the interests of the American taxpayer.

Mr. RANGEL. Well, I thought you've done a pretty ineffective job in selling your case to the Judiciary Committee as relates to your needs and even today, when we walked over to vote, I was informed by Mr. Hughes, which I don't know, I'm not on the Legislative Committee, that their vacancies—that there appears to be vacancies in U.S. Attorneys offices.

Mr. TROTT. May I answer that and tell you why? When Gramm-Rudman hit and you're right, I'm going to blame this on Gramm-Rudman, we found ourselves in a situation where we were looking the Anti-Deficiency Act right in the eye.

I'm a member of the Department Resources Board of the Justice Department and we got a financial profile of where we were in the United States Attorney's budget and we came to the conclusion that we had to put on a hiring freeze and operate by attrition in order to come in without going into the red by the end of the year.

So unfortunately, and this is one of the most distasteful things I've ever been involved in, we had to tell United States Attorneys to hold up hiring until the next fiscal year.

Well, what that creates is, going down and down and down trying to make the money that we were left with after Gramm-Rudman and what happens is then all of a sudden you reduce your forces to a very low level. We came in on target and then we get the money for the next go around and so here we are with a staffing level here and now we've got money for there. You don't build that overnight.

We're not going to hire lawyers just like that. We have to go out and we have to hire the best lawyers, you have to run them through the background checks, and bring them into the office and all the while you're fighting attrition, so slowly we've built it back up.

Orders have gone out into the field, build it up as fast as you can without delaying one second. If there's a vacancy out there, it's not because we don't need the position or we're not interested and not working, it's because we're still coming back from Gramm-Rudman and fighting the phenomenon that we have in the Federal government that causes Assistant United States Attorneys to leave after from three to five years, so we always have a fallout.

Mr. RANGEL. I know, but you can't blame the Congress for not appropriating money because it appears that you have a vacancy.

Mr. TROTT. I'm not blaming Congress.

Mr. RANGEL. You shouldn't fight against what—the reason that you resist money going to local and State law enforcement, Mr. Trott, in my opinion, has nothing to do with the needs, the financial needs of the Justice Department.

Mr. TROTT. Well, you're wrong.

Mr. RANGEL. Then you're saying for the record that the Congress understood and responded to the needs of the Justice Department that the Justice Department might think that there's an appropriate role for the Federal government to play in giving assistance to local and State law enforcement?

Mr. TROTT. We are so under-resourced right now at the Federal level. I can't even conceive within the next ten years of the eventuality that that could happen. Our prison population——

Mr. RANGEL. If you could conceive it, Mr. Trott, if you really could conceive that the 100th Congress would be intelligent enough to understand the needs of the Justice Department and would meet their needs, could you conceive that the Justice Department would be able to support a legislative program to give assistance to local and State law enforcement?

Mr. TROTT. Well, we have our own program and it does exactly that and we do it off the backs of the traffickers rather than out of the American taxpayers' pocketbook and we do it through the asset forfeiture program.

It was this Administration that conceived of the idea and implemented the idea of attacking the assets of drug traffickers and to make available Federal laws and Federal ports and Federal agencies to share those assets with State and local people.

Mr. RANGEL. No matter how much money we gave Justice, there's no way in the world for the Justice Department under the leadership of this Attorney General to support giving direct assistance to local and State law enforcement, isn't that true?

Mr. TROTT. No, I can't agree with that.

Mr. RANGEL. No matter what we gave to Justice, the whole concept of giving money to local and State——

Mr. TROTT. You see, Mr. Chairman, this to me sounds like the mistake the Federal government has made for years, throwing money away frequently doesn't help. By creating law enforcement coordinating committees and organized crime drug enforcement task force programs and asset forfeitures and, you know——

Mr. RANGEL. And giving a hand to local police and local prosecutors is throwing away money. And giving money to the U.S. Attorneys Office is the effective use of money.

Mr. TROTT. Federal money, yes.

Mr. RANGEL. Federal money.

Mr. TROTT. But you see the content——

Mr. RANGEL. And where does the Federal government get the Federal money?

Mr. TROTT. From the taxpayer.

Mr. RANGEL. And you consider as the Attorney General that the enforcement law as relates to 80% of the marijuana, all of the coca leaves, all of the opium, all of the tonnages coming across the United States borders, that the enforcement of that law by local and State officials is a local and State responsibility?

Mr. TROTT. Coming across the border?

Mr. RANGEL. After it gets across the border. That's the only way we——

Mr. TROTT. No, absolutely not.

Mr. RANGEL. You don't expect that the majority, that the overwhelming majority of the enforcement of narcotic laws in this United States is being done by local and State law enforcement?

Mr. TROTT. It's a partnership effort.

Mr. RANGEL. Partnership. I'm asking whether or not the Federal partnership should give some Federal dollars and you're saying no.

Mr. TROTT. Generally, I think that the answer to that should be no. I can tell you that when I was in the District Attorneys office——

Mr. RANGEL. When you say generally, that's a fantastic way——

Mr. TROTT. When I was in the District Attorneys office in Los Angeles County, I had a rule of thumb. Don't take Federal money on a bet and I'll tell you why. Because it's here today and gone tomorrow and then you're left holding the bag. That's been a part of our history also.

If you really believe in what you are doing and you are a State or local prosecutor, you'd better convince your own Board of Supervisors and your own State government to come up with the money to fund this on a permanent basis because that's what—would you believe LEAA was a success?

Mr. RANGEL. You know I work very closely with my local District Attorneys and they are thoroughly convinced that under the LEAA programs that they have been able to come up with creative programs that were so effective that they could then take them back to the various City Councils and State Legislatures and that they're now in effect as a result of having the ability to bring in these innovative programs. They truly believe it.

And it's not as though we're trying to Federalize them, but I'm thoroughly convinced that you feel uncomfortable in saying that the Federal government has no responsibility in this partnership to provide the Federal resources through assistance.

Mr. TROTT. What percentage of the tax dollar makes it back to the Los Angeles Police Department after it comes through the IRS and dispensing agencies with all the overhead?

Aren't we better off having the local taxing authorities figure out a way to fund the Los Angeles Police Department? Don't we save a lot of money in red tape and bureaucratic overhead?

Mr. **Rangel**. I don't know. It seems to me that the Federal government has a handful of people compared to the millions of people that are out there in local and State law enforcement and that we should have their expertise to be the lead forces in the coordination, task force programs that have worked so effectively, but in the City of New York where they had to consider pulling out policemen from the task force because they just couldn't afford to provide the foot soldiers for the strategies that were being developed.

It just seems to me that we should be able to be more sensitive to that need.

I want you to know that it'll hurt you as a law enforcement professional to know that we've taken testimony from sheriffs in your home State of California where the sheriff has told this Committee that he was not prosecuting certain cases because the taxpayers would resist paying the taxes that are necessary for the very expensive trials that they were having. Where was it in Redding?

Mr. **Trott**. Mr. Chairman, with your permission, may I be excused?

I'm just notified that I have a 1:00 o'clock meeting in the White House that I'm about to miss.

Mr. **Rangel**. If there is anything that you want to add to the record, rest assured, Mr. Trott, the record will remain open.

I thank the Admiral and I thank Customs for their attention.

The committee stands adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 12:55 p.m., the committee was adjourned.]

## PREPARED STATEMENTS

OPENING STATEMENT

CHARLES B. RANGEL

CHAIRMAN

SELECT COMMITTEE ON NARCOTICS ABUSE AND CONTROL

HEARING

INTERDICTION

UNDER THE ANTI-DRUG ABUSE ACT OF 1986: CONTINUATION

APRIL 30, 1987

10:00 A.M.

Good morning. Today's hearing is a continuation of our March 18 oversight hearing on the interdiction provisions of the "Anti-Drug Abuse Act of 1986."

I want to welcome back our witnesses:

Stephen S. Trott, Associate Attorney General and Chairman Enforcement Coordinating Group, National Drug Policy Board;

Admiral Paul Yost, Commandant, U.S. Coast Guard;

William von Raab, Commissioner, U.S. Customs Service.

I want to make certain that we hear from Commandant Yost this morning, as time constraints did not permit us to hear from him at the earlier hearing. Moreover, I hope that we will be able to address the interagency issues and concerns that we were also unable to discuss at that time.

Historically, the United States has approached the problem of drug trafficking and abuse incrementally with no clearly defined national strategy. The consequences of our failure to develop and implement such a policy are evident. Our past inaction, or at best inadequate action, has resulted in the flood of drugs into this country from abroad; and the deluge continues.

The Select Committee estimates that in 1986, 178 tons of cocaine were directed at the United States. This compares to 143 tons in 1985 and 115.7 tons in 1984. Although seizures of cocaine amounted to a record breaking 28 tons in 1986, the Committee estimates that 150 tons of cocaine were consumed in the U.S. in 1986.

The influx of heroin also increased. An estimated 12 tons entered the U.S. in 1986.

Although the Coast Guard reports a significant increase in seizures of marijuana coming from Colombia, the Select Committee estimates that between 30,000 and 60,000 tons of marijuana are still being smuggled into the United States annually. During 1986, the estimated level of hashish smuggled into the United States remained at 200 tons.

In 1987, we can expect the flow of drugs directed at the United States to continue. The State Department's International Narcotics Control Strategy Report (INCSR) for 1987 indicates bumper crops in every major drug producing country. Cocaine, marijuana, hashish, and heroin will inundate our borders from the air, sea, and land.

The "Anti-Drug Abuse Act of 1986" was a milestone in the war against drug trafficking and abuse. Underlying this legislation is a comprehensive national drug policy that addresses all aspects of the problem and reflects a long-term commitment to

CONFRONTING THE PROBLEMS OF DRUG TRAFFICKING AND ABUSE. WE AUTHORIZED NEW PROGRAMS AND APPROPRIATED MONEY TO IMPLEMENT THE PROGRAMS IN THE LEGISLATION. THIS INCLUDED FUNDS FOR INTERNATIONAL NARCOTICS CONTROL; INTERDICTION; FEDERAL DRUG ENFORCEMENT; FEDERAL ASSISTANCE TO STATE AND LOCAL DRUG ENFORCEMENT, DRUG ABUSE EDUCATION, PREVENTION, AND TREATMENT.

UNFORTUNATELY, IT WILL TAKE TIME TO SEE THE EFFECTS OF DRUG PREVENTION AND EDUCATION INITIATIVES, AS WELL AS OUR INTERNATIONAL NARCOTICS CONTROL EFFORTS. THEREFORE, UNTIL THE DAY THAT WE CAN STEM THE TIDE OF DRUGS AT THE SOURCE THROUGH DIPLOMACY AND EFFECTIVE AND AGGRESSIVE ERADICATION PROGRAMS, UNTIL THE DAY THAT EVERY CHILD RECEIVES EFFECTIVE DRUG PREVENTION EDUCATION, A MAJOR COMMITMENT TO INTERDICTION AND FEDERAL DRUG LAW ENFORCEMENT IS CRITICAL.

ESSENTIAL TO EFFECTIVE INTERDICTION IS ADEQUATE RESOURCES. WE IN THE CONGRESS AUTHORIZED WHAT WE BELIEVED TO BE ADEQUATE FUNDING LEVELS IN THE ANTI-DRUG ABUSE ACT OF 1986. ALTHOUGH THE PRESIDENT'S PROPOSED 1988 BUDGET INCLUDES FEWER CUTS IN THE AREA OF INTERDICTION THAN IT DOES IN THOSE OF DRUG ABUSE EDUCATION, PREVENTION, AND TREATMENT, THERE ARE SIGNIFICANT REDUCTIONS.

FOR EXAMPLE, THE PRESIDENT'S 1988 BUDGET PROPOSAL WOULD REDUCE THE CUSTOMS SERVICE BY APPROXIMATELY 1998 POSITIONS. MOREOVER, THE 1988 REQUEST OF $86 MILLION FOR THE CUSTOMS AIR PROGRAM, A CRITICAL LINK IN OUR INTERDICTION EFFORT, IS HALF OF THE 1987 FUNDING LEVEL OF $171 MILLION. THESE PROPOSALS JEOPAR-

DIZE THE EXPANSION OF CUSTOMS DRUG INSPECTIONS AT OUR BORDERS, THE DEVELOPMENT OF FACILITIES TO COORDINATE INTERDICTION ACTIVITIES EFFECTIVELY, THE DEPLOYMENT OF UPGRADED RADAR ON DRUG SURVEILLANCE AIRCRAFT, AND THE OPERATION OF AIRCRAFT TO TRACK MARINE DRUG SMUGGLERS.

ALTHOUGH ADEQUATE RESOURCES ARE CRITICAL TO AN EFFECTIVE WAR ON DRUGS, IN AND OF THEMSELVES, RESOURCES WILL NOT ENSURE EFFECTIVE DRUG INTERDICTION. LEADERSHIP; INTERAGENCY COORDINATION AND COOPERATION; AND RELIABLE AND TIMELY STRATEGIC, TACTICAL, AND OPERATIONAL INTELLIGENCE ARE ALSO ESSENTIAL.

ASSERTIVE LEADERSHIP TO DIRECT A NATIONAL NARCOTICS CONTROL STRATEGY IS VITAL TO OUR NATION'S FUTURE. THE ADMINISTRATION HAS BEEN SLOW TO PROVIDE THE NECESSARY LEADERSHIP. THE EFFORTS OF THE FIRST LADY ARE ALL WELL AND GOOD, BUT SHE IS IN NO POSITION TO PROVIDE THE LEADERSHIP NEEDED, AS SHE IS NEITHER AN APPOINTED NOR AN ELECTED OFFICIAL. THOSE WHO ARE IN A POSITION TO LEAD HAVE FAILED TO DO SO -- THE SECRETARY OF STATE, THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE, EVEN THE ATTORNEY GENERAL -- HAVE NOT COME FORTH TO PLAY AN ACTIVE ROLE IN COMBATTING DRUG TRAFFICKING AND ABUSE. THE TIME HAS COME FOR THIS TO CHANGE.

I WAS PLEASED WHEN THE ADMINISTRATION ANNOUNCED THAT IT WAS GOING TO CENTRALIZE DRUG CONTROL POLICY -- BOTH SUPPLY AND DEMAND -- IN ONE CABINET LEVEL BOARD, THE NATIONAL DRUG POLICY BOARD. I AM ALSO PLEASED TO NOTE THAT SINCE OUR MARCH 18 HEARING, THE EXECUTIVE ORDER (12590) CREATING THIS BOARD HAS BEEN

SIGNED. UNDER THE LEADERSHIP OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL PERHAPS THIS NEW POLICY BOARD WILL BE ABLE TO PROVIDE THE NECESSARY LEADERSHIP.

IN THAT REGARD, I HOPE THAT I WILL FINALLY BE ABLE TO RECEIVE THE ANSWERS TO THREE QUESTIONS: WHO IS IN CHARGE OF FEDERAL DRUG ABUSE POLICY? WHO DETERMINES THE ADMINISTRATION'S DRUG-RELATED BUDGETARY PRIORITIES? WHAT IS OUR NATIONAL INTERDICTION STRATEGY?

EFFECTIVE LEADERSHIP INCLUDES ENSURING THAT AGENCY ACTIVITIES ON ALL LEVELS--POLICY PLANNING TO CARRYING OUT DRUG RAIDS--ARE COORDINATED. AT A RECENT MEETING WITH THE ATTORNEY GENERAL, HE ASSURED ME THAT WE DO HAVE A FEDERAL DRUG POLICY AND IT IS COORDINATED THROUGH THE NATIONAL DRUG POLICY BOARD. NOW, I DO NOT DOUBT THE ATTORNEY GENERAL'S WORD, BUT THE COORDINATION OF WHICH HE SPEAKS ESCAPES ME. WHEN ONE HEARS THAT AGENCIES CANNOT COMMUNICATE WITH EACH OTHER, BECAUSE THEIR RADIOS DO NOT OPERATE ON THE SAME FREQUENCY OR THAT AGENCIES CANNOT AGREE OVER WHO HAS JURISDICTION OVER THE LAND, THE SEA, OR EVEN WHICH COAST OR BORDER, IT IS DIFFICULT TO ACCEPT HIS ASSESSMENT. IF A CLEAR AND COORDINATED NATIONAL POLICY IS SO DIFFICULT FOR US TO SEE, WHAT MESSAGE, WHAT SIGNAL ARE WE SENDING TO STATE AND LOCAL DRUG LAW ENFORCEMENT? THE DRUG PRODUCING NATIONS? THE DRUG TRAFFICKERS? THE DRUG USERS?

WE ARE IN THE MIDST OF A WAR. THIS IS NEITHER THE TIME NOR THE PLACE FOR TURF BATTLES, MISPLACED AGENCY LOYALTY, OR FALSE

BRAVADO. BUT, TO OVERCOME THESE PROBLEMS DIRECTION MUST COME FROM THE TOP. WITHOUT SUCH LEADERSHIP, WE WILL SEE VALUABLE RESOURCES LOST AND WE MAY LOSE A WAR THAT WE SIMPLY CANNOT AFFORD TO LOSE.

CRITICAL TO EFFECTIVE DECISION-MAKING AT ALL LEVELS OF OUR ANTI-DRUG EFFORTS IS QUALITY INFORMATION. OUR INTERDICTION EFFORTS MUST BE MORE THAN A MATTER OF LUCK OR ACCIDENT. THIS REQUIRES RELIABLE INTELLIGENCE ABOUT BROAD TRENDS, IN ORDER TO DEVELOP POLICIES AND PLAN; TACTICAL INFORMATION TO DETECT AND IDENTIFY TARGETS; AND OPERATIONAL INTELLIGENCE TO SUPPORT THE INVESTIGATIVE AND PROSECUTORIAL PROCESSES.

THE ANTI-DRUG ABUSE ACT OF 1986 PROVIDED A VARIETY OF RESOURCES--EQUIPMENT, PERSONNEL, AND FACILITIES--TO ENHANCE OUR DRUG-RELATED INTELLIGENCE CAPACITY. FOR EXAMPLE, THE COAST GUARD AND CUSTOMS SERVICE HAVE EACH BEEN PROVIDED WITH TWO E-2C RADAR-EQUIPPED AIRCRAFT. WE AUTHORIZED THE ESTABLISHMENT OF NATIONAL COMMAND, CONTROL, COMMUNICATIONS, AND INTELLIGENCE CENTERS (C3IS) TO PROVIDE TACTICAL COORDINATION FOR INTERDICTION EFFORTS. ADDITIONAL AEROSTATS HAVE BEEN AUTHORIZED FOR THE SOUTHWEST BORDER AND THE BAHAMAS IN ORDER TO INCREASE RADAR DETECTION CAPABILITIES.

TO BE EFFECTIVE, HOWEVER, THE INFORMATION GATHERED WITH THE NEW TECHNOLOGY MUST BE USED; IT MUST BE SHARED. HERE AGAIN, IT GREATLY DISTURBS ME TO HEAR OF INTERAGENCY FAILURES TO COMMUNICATE AND JURISDICTIONAL SQUABBLES. THE SHARING OF INFORMATION

FOR EFFECTIVE INTERDICTION MUST BE A TOP PRIORITY. I SINCERELY HOPE THAT THE NATIONAL DRUG POLICY BOARD WILL PLAY AN ACTIVE ROLE TO ENSURE THAT THIS IS A TOP PRIORITY.

AFTER THIS MORNING'S HEARING, I HOPE THAT THE MEMBERS OF THE SELECT COMMITTEE WILL HAVE A BETTER UNDERSTANDING OF THE LEADERSHIP ROLE TO BE PLAYED BY THE DRUG POLICY BOARD IN THE AREA OF INTERDICTION, THE EXTENT OF INTERAGENCY COOPERATION, THE PROCESS BY WHICH INTERAGENCY DISPUTES ARE RESOLVED, AND THE STATUS OF THE DRUG INTERDICTION INTELLIGENCE INITIATIVES AUTHORIZED UNDER THE ANTI-DRUG ABUSE ACT.

IN LIGHT OF THE FACT THAT THE REORGANIZATION RECOMMENDATIONS REQUIRED UNDER THE ANTI-DRUG ABUSE ACT WERE TO BE REPORTED THIS WEEK AND THE PLANNING REPORT MANDATED IN THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION IS DUE EARLY NEXT MONTH, I HOPE THAT YOU WILL ALSO BE ABLE TO INFORM US OF NEW DIRECTIONS AND INITIATIVES PLANNED BY THE ADMINISTRATION.

FINALLY, I HOPE THAT WE WILL LEAVE HERE KNOWING WHAT OUR NATIONAL DRUG INTERDICTION STRATEGY IS.

U.S. Department
of Transportation
**United States
Coast Guard**

Commandant
United States Coast Guard

Washington, D.C. 20593-0001
Staff Symbol:
Phone:

PREPARED STATEMENT

OF

ADMIRAL PAUL A. YOST
COMMANDANT, UNITED STATES COAST GUARD

BEFORE THE

SELECT COMMITTEE ON
NARCOTICS ABUSE AND CONTROL

APRIL 30, 1987

MR. CHAIRMAN AND MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE, IT IS A PLEASURE TO APPEAR BEFORE YOU TODAY TO PROVIDE AN OVERVIEW OF THE COAST GUARD'S EFFORTS PURSUANT TO THE PROVISIONS OF THE "ANTI-DRUG ABUSE ACT OF 1986".

THE ACT INCLUDED $89M FOR THE COAST GUARD'S ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION AND IMPROVEMENT ACCOUNT TO PROCURE LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSETS AND $39M IN OPERATING EXPENSES TO INCREASE THE COAST GUARD ACTIVE DUTY STRENGTH FOR FISCAL YEAR 1987, AND TO OPERATE TWO C-130s AND FIVE PATROL CRAFT. IN ADDITION, THE ANTI-DRUG ABUSE ACT OF 1986 ESTABLISHED A UNITED STATES-BAHAMAS DRUG INTERDICTION TASK FORCE, AUTHORIZED A BAHAMAS DRUG INTERDICTION DOCKING FACILITY AND SEPARATE BOAT LIFE FACILITY TO BE LOCATED IN THE BAHAMAS, CODIFIED NAVY SUPPORT OF COAST GUARD LAW ENFORCEMENT DETACHMENTS (LEDETS) ON NAVY VESSELS IN 10 USC 379, MODIFIED THE MANSFIELD AMENDMENT WHICH AUTHORIZED MARITIME LAW ENFORCEMENT ACTION IN A CONSENTING NATION'S TERRITORIAL SEAS, PROVIDED ADDITIONAL FUNDING FOR ENHANCED COMMUNICATIONS AND SURVEILLANCE CAPABILITIES, AND IMPROVED 21 USC 955A, MAKING IT A MORE EFFECTIVE LAW ENFORCEMENT TOOL.

**MANSFIELD AMENDMENT**

PRIOR TO THE ANTI-DRUG ABUSE ACT OF 1986, THE MANSFIELD AMENDMENT TO THE FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT (22 USC 2291(C)(1)) PROVIDED THAT "NO OFFICER OR EMPLOYEE OF THE UNITED STATES MAY ENGAGE IN ANY DIRECT POLICE ARREST ACTION IN ANY FOREIGN COUNTRY WITH RESPECT TO NARCOTICS CONTROL EFFORTS." THIS PROVISION PREVENTED OUR DIRECT INVOLVEMENT WITH FOREIGN LAW ENFORCEMENT PERSONNEL IN DRUG ARRESTS WITHIN FOREIGN WATERS. THIS HAD OFTEN PREVENTED US FROM PROVIDING DIRECT ASSISTANCE TO OUR CARIBBEAN NEIGHBORS WHEN THEY HAVE

ASKED FOR IT AND HAS LIMITED TRAINING OPPORTUNITIES WHEN THE POSSIBILITY OF ACTUAL LAW ENFORCEMENT EXISTED. SECTION 2009 OF THE ANTI-DRUG ABUSE ACT OF 1986 PROVIDED THAT MARITIME LAW ENFORCEMENT IN A CONSENTING NATION'S TERRITORIAL SEA WAS EXCLUDED FROM THE MANSFIELD RESTRICTION. SINCE THE EXCLUSION FOR MARITIME LAW ENFORCEMENT HAS BEEN IMPLEMENTED, THE COAST GUARD HAS RESPONDED TO REQUESTS FROM THE BAHAMAS, PANAMA, AND THE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC TO ENGAGE IN COOPERATIVE EFFORTS WITHIN THEIR TERRITORIAL SEA TO SUPPRESS ILLICIT DRUG TRAFFICKING.

21 USC 955A

THE ANTI-DRUG ABUSE ACT OF 1986 PROVIDED SIGNIFICANT IMPROVEMENTS TO THE PROHIBITION AGAINST DRUG TRAFFICKING, CODIFIED AT 21 USC 955A. IN 1980, PUBLIC LAW 96-350 REFERRED TO AS THE "BIAGGI-GILMAN BILL", CLOSED A LOOPHOLE IN THE LAW BY ESTABLISHING A SUBSTANTIVE OFFENSE AGAINST DRUG TRAFFICKING. WHILE THIS LEGISLATION WAS EXTREMELY EFFECTIVE IN INCREASING PROSECUTION AND CONVICTION OF TRAFFICKERS, IT CONTAINED PROVISIONS WHICH RAISED NEW DIFFICULTIES FOR PROSECUTORS UNRELATED TO THE MERITS OF THE CASE. JURISDICTIONAL LANGUAGE CONCERNING STATELESS AND FOREIGN VESSELS HAD FREQUENTLY BECOME THE MAJOR ISSUE IN A CASE. THESE PROBLEMS HAVE BEEN CORRECTED THROUGH THE AMENDMENTS OF THE ANTI-DRUG ABUSE ACT OF 1986 WHICH ALLOWS THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE TO CERTIFY EXISTENCE OF A SUSPECTED VESSEL'S CLAIM OF FOREIGN REGISTRY. IF A VESSEL IS NOT CERTIFIED AS HAVING LEGITIMATE FOREIGN REGISTRY BY THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE, IT MAY NOW BE ASSIMILATED AS STATELESS AND SUBJECT TO U.S. LAW FOR THE PURPOSE OF CHARGING A VIOLATION OF 955A(A), POSSESSION WITH INTENT TO DISTRIBUTE.

**TACLET/LEDET**

EMBARKING CG PERSONNEL ABOARD NAVY VESSELS FOR LAW ENFORCEMENT PURPOSES WAS CODIFIED BY THE ANTI-DRUG ABUSE ACT OF 1986 IN TITLE 10 USC SECTION 379. I AM VERY PLEASED WITH THE PERFORMANCE OF OUR LAW ENFORCEMENT DETACHMENTS ABOARD NAVY VESSELS. SMUGGLERS MUST NOW AVOID ALL NAVY AS WELL AS COAST GUARD UNITS SINCE THEY DO NOT KNOW WHETHER THE COAST GUARD TACLET/LEDET IS ABOARD. THE NAVY IS FULLY COMMITTED TO THE INTERDICTION OF DRUGS AT SEA. SINCE 1 OCTOBER 1986, THE NAVY HAS ASSISTED IN SEIZING 19 VESSELS INCLUDING THE ARREST OF 110 SMUGGLERS AND THE INTERDICTION OF 243,017 POUNDS OF MARIJUANA AND 989 POUNDS OF COCAINE, WITH AN ESTIMATED VALUE OF OVER $284M.

IN FY 1986 AND FY 1987, 500 ADDITIONAL POSITIONS WERE PROVIDED FOR LAW ENFORCEMENT DETACHMENTS. WHEN NOT ON A NAVY DEPLOYMENT, THESE PERSONNEL AUGMENT COAST GUARD STATIONS CONDUCTING LAW ENFORCEMENT OPERATIONS, AN IMPORTANT FLEXIBILITY JUST AUTHORIZED FOR THIS PROGRAM. BECAUSE PERSONNEL FILLING THESE BILLETS REQUIRE A HIGH LEVEL OF TRAINING, THE COAST GUARD WAS UNABLE TO IMMEDIATELY DEPLOY 500 QUALIFIED PERSONNEL BUT BEGAN A CONCERTED RECRUITING AND TRAINING EFFORT IN FY 1986. HOWEVER, BASED ON OUR EXPERIENCE AND THE AVAILABILITY OF SUITABLE NAVY SHIPS, A LEVEL OF 300 PEOPLE IS ADEQUATE. THE PRESIDENT'S FY 1988 BUDGET PROPOSES THAT THIS 300 LEVEL BE MADE PERMANENT (VICE NAVY REIMBURSED) IN THE FY 1988 COAST GUARD BUDGET. AS OF EARLY 1987, 84% OF THE 300 BILLETS WERE FILLED AND I EXPECT ALL 300 TO BE FILLED BY JULY.

### CURRENT OPERATIONS

STARTING IN THE FALL OF 1984 WITH OPERATION WAGONWHEEL, THE COAST GUARD'S PORTION OF HAT TRICK I, INTERDICTION ACTIVITIES WERE TAKEN RIGHT TO THE DOORSTEP OF THE PRIMARY SOURCE COUNTRIES OF THE CARIBBEAN BASIN. OPERATION HAT TRICK WAS THE FIRST OF SEVERAL MULTIAGENCY, INTERNATIONAL OPERATIONS OF RECENT YEARS EMPLOYING MAXIMUM RESOURCES AND FLEXIBILITY TO COMPLEMENT THE ANTI-DRUG OPERATIONS BEING CARRIED OUT BY FOREIGN FORCES IN-COUNTRY, BOTH ASHORE AND AFLOAT. THESE OPERATIONS HAVE BEEN AN EXTREMELY EFFECTIVE ADJUNCT TO OUR OWN ONGOING INTERDICTION PROGRAMS. OF THE $39M PROVIDED IN THE DRUG SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT, $22.1M IS BEING USED TO OFFSET FUEL REDUCTIONS MANDATED LAST YEAR DURING BUDGET CUTS. THIS HAS ALLOWED THE CURRENT LEVEL OF OPERATIONS TO CONTINUE. IN ADDITION TO THE NAVY ASSISTED SEIZURES, IN FY 1987 THROUGH 27 APRIL, THE COAST GUARD HAS SEIZED 65 VESSELS AND MADE 233 ARRESTS; INTERDICTED OVER 511,000 POUNDS OF MARIJUANA; 4,139 POUNDS OF COCAINE, AND 13 GALLONS OF HASHISH OIL WITH AN ESTIMATED VALUE OF OVER $665M. THE COAST GUARD HAS ASSISTED OTHER AGENCIES IN 9 ADDITIONAL SEIZURES, INCLUDING THE INTERDICITON OF 1,842 POUNDS OF COCAINE AND 10,996 POUNDS OF MARIJUANA. AS AN OUTGROWTH OF THE WINTER OPERATIONS AND THE REVISION TO THE MANSFIELD AMENDMENT, MANY CARIBBEAN BASIN NATIONS HAVE COME FORWARD AND ARE ENGAGED IN VARYING DEGREES OF COOPERATION.

### ENHANCED COMMUNICATIONS

OPERATIONAL SECURITY SURVEYS HAVE CONSISTENTLY POINTED OUT COMMUNICATIONS SECURITY IS NECESSARY TO PROTECT PLANNING AND EXECUTION OF COAST GUARD DRUG ENFORCEMENT OPERATIONS. WHILE DISTRICT OFFICES, COMMUNICATIONS STATIONS AND

MAJOR CUTTERS (WMEC AND LARGER) HAVE TRADITIONALLY BEEN OUTFITTED WITH CRYPTOGRAPHIC SYSTEMS TO PROTECT LAW ENFORCEMENT INFORMATION, SMALLER COAST GUARD UNITS HAVE LACKED EFFECTIVE MEANS TO PROTECT THIS INFORMATION. THE DRUG OMNIBUS BILL MONEY ALLOCATED $11M FOR ENHANCED SECURE COMMUNICATIONS. THE ANTI-DRUG ABUSE ACT OF 1986 AUTHORIZED $11M FOR ENHANCED SECURE COMMUNICATIONS. I EXPECT A $5M CONTRACT FOR SECURE VHF-FM EQUIPMENT TO BE AWARDED IN EARLY APRIL. THE REMAINING $6M IS DIVIDED INTO $3.5M FOR TACTICAL COMMAND, CONTROL AND COMMUNICATIONS, $1.5M FOR AIRCRAFT SECURE COMMUNICATIONS, $.5M FOR SHIPBOARD SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS AND $.5M FOR LONG-RANGE HF COMMUNICATION UPGRADES.

## AIR INTERDICTION

FEDERAL EFFORTS AGAINST DRUG TRAFFICKING CANNOT SUCCEED WITHOUT PROPORTIONAL PRESSURE PLACED ON ALL MODES OF TRAFFICKING. HOWEVER, IT QUICKLY BECAME APPARENT THAT WHILE SURFACE MARITIME TRAFFICKING IS BEING GREATLY REDUCED DURING OUR WINTER OPERATIONS, AIR TRAFFICKING CONTINUES VIRTUALLY UNABATED. COCAINE AND OTHER NARCOTICS ARRIVING FROM OVER THE MARITIME REGION BY AIR, BEING AIRDROPPED TO WAITING BOATS, OR TRANSSHIPPED THROUGH THE BAHAMAS BY USE OF FAST BOATS INTO THE UNITED STATES, HAS GROWN INTO A MAJOR PROBLEM. THIS WAS ONE OF MY HIGHEST PRIORITIES WHEN I BECAME COMMANDANT AND I HAD MY STAFF DEVISE A CONCEPT OF OPERATIONS THAT WOULD EFFICIENTLY PROVIDE COAST GUARD ASSISTANCE TO OTHER FEDERAL AIR INTERDICTION EFFORTS. I AM COORDINATING THIS PLAN WITH THE NATIONAL DRUG ENFORCEMENT POLICY BOARD AND SEVERAL WORKING GROUPS.

THE ANTI-DRUG ABUSE ACT OF 1986 HAS PROVIDED THE COAST GUARD ASSETS FOR AIR INTERDICTION IN THE MARITIME REGION. $8.6M OF THE $39M APPROPRIATIONS SUPPLEMENTAL FUNDING IS BEING USED TO OPERATE TWO E-2s, WITH OPERATING COST OF THE AIRPLANES AT $7M AND PERSONNEL COST AT $1.6M. OPERATION OF THE TWO E-2Cs WE RECEIVED COMMENCED IN JANUARY AND OUR HU-25 AIRCRAFT ARE FLYING DAYTIME VFR INTERCEPTS. AS A RESULT, THE COAST GUARD HAS ALREADY ASSISTED IN THE SEIZURE OF 528 POUNDS OF COCAINE, THE SEIZURE OF AN AIRCRAFT, AND THE ARREST OF 6 SMUGGLERS IN THE FIRST 12 OPERATIONAL FLIGHTS OF OUR E-2Cs. EIGHT HU-25s WILL BECOME EVEN MORE EFFECTIVE INTERCEPTORS WHEN SENSORS CAN BE INSTALLED. THESE EARLY OPERATIONS, HOWEVER, HAVE IMPRESSED ON ME THE IMPORTANCE OF A SOUTHEAST MARITIME REGIONAL CONTROL, COMMUNICATION AND INTELLIGENCE (C3I) CENTER UNDER COAST GUARD COMMAND FOR AIR INTERDICTION. TO BE MOST EFFECTIVE, ALL AIR INTERDICTION ASSETS MUST BE CONTROLLED FROM A CENTRALIZED LOCATION THAT WILL MAINTAIN THE "BIG PICTURE".

### SURVEILLANCE CAPABILITIES

I HAVE IMPLEMENTED $38M OF THE $89M AC&I FUNDING TO PROCURE TWO C-130 AIRCRAFT. I EXPECT DELIVERY OF THE TWO AIRCRAFT IN DECEMBER OF THIS YEAR. ANOTHER $35M WAS TRANSFERRED TO THE NAVY ON 10 FEBRUARY AND AWARDED ON 25 FEBRUARY AS PART OF AN EXISTING NAVY CONTRACT FOR PROCUREMENT OF FIVE NEW PATROL BOATS. $1.8M OF THE $39M DRUG SUPPLEMENTAL FUNDING HAS BEEN ALLOCATED FOR PIPELINE TRAINING FOR THE CREWS OF THE 5 NEW PATROL BOATS AND C-130 CREWS. $3.5M OF THE $39M DRUG SUPPLEMENTAL FUNDING WILL BE USED TO PURCHASE NEW EQUIPMENT INCLUDING NIGHT VISION DEVICES, SURVEILLANCE CAMERAS, AND AIRCRAFT LIFE SUPPORT SYSTEMS.

**BAHAMAS INITIATIVES**

THE ANTI-DRUG ABUSE ACT OF 1986 AUTHORIZED $5M FOR CONSTRUCTION OF A DRUG INTERDICTION DOCKING FACILITY IN THE BAHAMAS TO FACILITATE COAST GUARD AND BAHAMIAN DRUG INTERDICTION OPERATIONS, AND TO ESTABLISH A MAINTENANCE AND BOAT LIFT FACILITY USABLE BY COAST GUARD AND BAHAMIAN VESSELS. WE HAVE MOVED QUICKLY TO IMPLEMENT THESE FACILITIES. AS REQUESTED BY THE GOVERNMENT OF THE BAHAMAS, A BOAT LIFT FACILITY WILL BE ESTABLISHED AT THE PERMANENT BAHAMIAN DEFENSE FORCE BASE AT CORAL HARBOR, PROVIDENCE ISLAND. THE COAST GUARD HAS ALREADY AWARDED THE CONTRACT FOR A TRAVELIFT TO BE PURCHASED FOR THE SITE. THE SEVENTH COAST GUARD DISTRICT IN MIAMI IS PROCEEDING WITH ENGINEERING PLANS FOR THE PROPER PIER AND FACILITY SUPPORT FOR THE TRAVELIFT. TO ESTABLISH THE DRUG INTERDICTION DOCKING FACILITY, SEVERAL SITES IN THE BAHAMAS HAVE BEEN STUDIED. THE COAST GUARD HAS IDENTIFIED A PROMISING SITE IN THE SOUTHERN BAHAMAS, A FORMER U.S. NAVY SEAPLANE FACILITY LOCATED APPROXIMATELY 2 MILES NORTH OF GEORGETOWN. NEGOTIATIONS WITH THE BAHAMIAN GOVERNMENT FOR THIS PROPERTY ARE ON GOING UNDER THE AUSPICES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

COAST GUARD DRUG INTERDICTION EFFORTS IN THE BAHAMAS INCLUDES SUPPORT OF OPERATION BAHAMAS, TURKS AND CAICOS (OPBAT). ONE COAST GUARD HH-3F HELICOPTER HAS BEEN PROVIDING DAYTIME SUPPORT, AND I PLAN TO PROVIDE 24 HOUR COAST GUARD SUPPORT BY DECEMBER, 1987. IN FEBRUARY I ENTERED INTO AN AGREEMENT WITH THE UNITED STATES CUSTOMS SERVICE TO PROVIDE BAHAMAS HELICOPTER AND COMMUNICATIONS SUPPORT AUTHORIZED IN THE ANTI-DRUG ABUSE ACT. THE CUSTOMS SERVICE TRANSFERRED $8M OF THE FUNDS AUTHORIZED TO THEM IN THE 86 ACT FOR THIS PURPOSE.

TO ASSIST IN THESE INITIATIVES FROM WITHIN THE BAHAMAS, THE U.S. AMBASSADOR TO THE BAHAMAS REQUESTED THE ASSIGNMENT OF A COAST GUARD LIAISON OFFICER (CGLO) FOR HER STAFF. THE CGLO WILL BE THE PRIMARY POINT OF CONTACT AND COORDINATOR FOR NARCOTICS INTERDICTION MATTERS RELATING TO THESE AND OTHER SIMILAR INITIATIVES. THIS OFFICER REPORTED FOR DUTY ON 2 APRIL 1987.

THE COAST GUARD HAS BEEN WORKING CLOSELY WITH THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE ON ALL EFFORTS RELATED TO THE BAHAMAS. AS INDICATED IN THE ACT, THE COAST GUARD HAS RECEIVED CONCURRENCE BY THE SECRETARY OF STATE WHEN CARRYING OUT PROGRAMS AUTHORIZED BY THE ACT. I ANTICIPATE CONTINUED PROGRESS IN THESE IMPORTANT ISSUES REGARDING INTERDICTION EFFORTS IN THE BAHAMAS.

THE COAST GUARD IS MOVING RAPIDLY TO IMPLEMENT FULLY THE ANTI-DRUG ABUSE ACT. AS WE BRING NEW ASSETS AND RESPONSIBILITIES FROM THE ACT ON LINE, WE ARE CONTINUING TO PUT FORTH THE MAXIMUM EFFORT WITH OUR EXISTING RESOURCES. BECAUSE OF THE COMPLEXITY OF THE ILLEGAL DRUG THREAT TO THIS COUNTRY AND THE NEED FOR A COMPREHENSIVE DRUG EDUCATION PROGRAM, I CANNOT PROMISE THAT THE "WAR" WILL BE WON SOON. HOWEVER, THROUGH CLOSE COOPERATION WITH OTHER AGENCIES AND YOUR SUPPORT OF THE PRESIDENT'S INITIATIVES, WE HOPE TO REDUCE GREATLY THE FLOW OF ILLEGAL DRUGS INTO OUR COUNTRY.

THIS CONCLUDES MY PREPARED TESTIMONY, I WILL BE HAPPY TO ANSWER ANY QUESTIONS.

SUMMARY OF OMNIBUS DRUG FUNDING:

### $89M AC&I FUNDING

| | |
|---|---|
| BAHAMA DOCKING FACILITY AND TRAVEL LIFT | $5M |
| PROCURE TWO C-130 AIRCRAFT | $38M |
| PROCURE 5 PATROL CRAFT | $35M |
| ENHANCE COMMUNICATIONS | $11M |
| TOTAL | $89M |

### $39M SUPPLEMENTAL FUNDING

| | |
|---|---|
| RECRUITING | $3.0M |
| E-2C OPERATION | $8.6M |
| CURRENT OPERATION | $22.1M |
| NEW EQUIPMENT | $3.5M |
| PIPELINE TRAINING | $1.8M |
| TOTAL | $39.0M |

U.S. CUSTOMS SERVICE

STATEMENT OF WILLIAM VON RAAB

COMMISSIONER OF CUSTOMS

FOR DELIVERY BEFORE

THE HOUSE SELECT COMMITTEE

ON NARCOTICS ABUSE

AND CONTROL

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MARCH 18, 1987

MR. CHAIRMAN AND MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE, I AM PLEASED TO APPEAR BEFORE YOU TODAY TO DISCUSS ACTIONS WHICH CUSTOMS HAS TAKEN PURSUANT TO THE OMNIBUS DRUG ENFORCEMENT, EDUCATION, AND CONTROL ACT OF 1986, IN ORDER TO STEM THE FLOW OF ILLEGAL NARCOTICS INTO THIS COUNTRY.

SINCE 1981, WHEN I BECAME COMMISSIONER OF CUSTOMS, I HAVE DEVOTED MUCH OF MY PERSONAL ENERGY AND THE AGENCY'S RESOURCES TO DRUG INTERDICTION. I BELIEVE DRUGS ARE THE MOST SERIOUS ENEMY FACING OUR NATION. DRUG ABUSE AFFECTS THE VERY FOUNDATION OF OUR DEMOCRACY, THE HEALTH AND WELL-BEING OF OUR CHILDREN, AND THE VALUES AND MORALS OF THIS AND FUTURE GENERATIONS. I AM PLEASED TO HAVE A MAJOR ROLE IN COMBATTING THIS PROBLEM AND AM DEDICATED TO THE EFFORT.

AS YOU KNOW MR. CHAIRMAN, THIS ACT, P.L. 99-570, (OCTOBER 27, 1986), IS ONLY THE MOST RECENT CONGRESSIONAL ACTION CONFIRMING THE STATUS OF THE U.S. CUSTOMS SERVICE AS THE LEAD FEDERAL AGENCY FOR DRUG INTERDICTION AT THE BORDERS. THIS ROLE CAN BE TRACED BACK TO THE EARLIEST LEGISLATIVE DECISIONS OF THIS NATIONS FIRST CONGRESS. THE CUSTOMS SERVICE WAS CREATED BY THE SECOND ACT OF CONGRESS 1789 AND GIVEN RESPONSIBILITY FOR THE INTERDICTION OF ALL MERCHANDISE BEING IMPORTED OR EXPORTED CONTRARY TO LAW. THERE ARE NUMEROUS CUSTOMS STATUTES, MANY OF WHICH CAN BE TRACED TO THE SECOND ACT OF CONGRESS WHICH MANDATED OUR LEAD INTERDICTION ROLE. FOR EXAMPLE:

-- 19 U.S.C. 482: BORDER SEARCH AND SEIZURE AUTHORITY FOR VESSELS, VEHICLES, PERSONS AND MERCHANDISE .

-- 19 U.S.C. 1467: REINSPECTION OF VESSELS, PERSONS, AND MERCHANDISE AT SUCCESSIVE PORTS.

-- 19 U.S.C. 1499: EXAMINATION AND CLEARANCE AUTHORITY FOR ALL IMPORTED MERCHANDISE.

-- 19 U.S.C. 1581: AUTHORITY FOR BOARDING VESSELS AND VEHICLES, BORDER SEARCHING CONVEYANCES, MERCHANDISE, AND PERSONS, ETC.

-- 19 U.S.C. 1582: DETENTION FOR CUSTOMS PROCESSING OF PERSONS ENTERING THE U.S.

-- THE ANTI-SMUGGLING ACT OF 1935: VARIOUS BOARD AUTHORITIES (IN TITLE 19) CONCERNING CUSTOMS AUTHORITY TO BOARD AND EXAMINE VESSELS.

-- REORGANIZATION PLAN NO.2 OF 1973, 87 STAT. 1091, 1973 U.S.C., CONGRESSIONAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE NEWS 3554. ALTHOUGH THIS REORGANIZATION PLAN CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY FEDERAL DRUG ENFORCEMENT RESPONSIBILITY IN THE JUSTICE DEPARTMENT, IT SPECIFICALLY LEFT THE BORDER DRUG INTERDICTION FUNCTION WITH CUSTOMS. (I.E. "THE SECRETARY (I.E. CUSTOMS) SHALL RETAIN AND CONTINUE TO PERFORM, (INTELLIGENCE, INVESTIGATIVE, AND LAW ENFORCEMENT) FUNCTIONS, TO

THE EXTENT THAT THEY RELATE TO SEARCHES AND SEIZURES OF ILLICIT NARCOTICS, DANGEROUS DRUGS, OR MARIJUANA OR TO THE APPREHENSION OR DETENTION OF PERSONS IN CONNECTION THEREWITH, AT REGULAR INSPECTION LOCATIONS AT PORTS OF ENTRY OR ANYWHERE ALONG THE LAND OR WATER BORDER OF THE UNITED STATES." (SEE SECTION 1 OF REORGANIZATION PLAN NO.2 OF 1973)

-- THE CUSTOMS ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 1986 PASSED AS PART OF P.L. 99-570 (OCTOBER 27, 1986). THIS COMPREHENSIVE REVISION OF CUSTOMS ENFORCEMENT AUTHORITIES CONTAINS NEW STATUTES ON OUR INTERDICTION ROLE. FOR EXAMPLE, 19 U.S.C. 1590 WAS ENACTED AS A MAJOR NEW AVIATION SMUGGLING PROHIBITION.

-- 49 U.S.C. 1509 AND 19 U.S.C. 1644: MANDATES CUSTOMS TO ASSURE THAT CIVIL AIRCRAFT ARRIVING INTO THE U.S. COMPLY WITH ALL CUSTOMS REQUIREMENTS AND LAWS CONCERNING IMPORTS.

THE CUSTOMS SERVICE HAS EXTENSIVE AUTHORITY AND A HISTORICAL TRADITION IN COMBATTING THIS SERIOUS PROBLEM. THIS ACT ADDS TO IT.

USING THIS AUTHORITY ENABLED CUSTOMS AGENTS, INSPECTORS, MARINE AND AIR UNITS TO SEIZE 52,521 POUNDS OF COCAINE, THIS NATIONS NUMBER ONE NARCOTICS THREAT, 692 POUNDS OF HEROIN, 2,211,068 POUNDS OF MARIJUANA AND 17,555 POUNDS OF HASHISH IN FY 1986. EARLY THIS YEAR CUSTOMS INSPECTORS SEIZED TWO CONTAINERS WITH 6,900 POUNDS OF COCAINE, THE LARGEST SINGLE SEIZURE OF COCAINE IN U.S. HISTORY.

DESPITE THESE SUCCESSES, THIS COUNTRY CONTINUES TO FACE THE THREAT OF ILLEGAL IMPORTATION OF BUMPER CROPS OF COCAINE, MARIJUANA AND HEROIN. CUSTOMS IS NOW BUSY HIRING, PROCURING AND DEPLOYING THE PEOPLE AND ASSETS PROVIDED BY THE 1986 OMNIBUS DRUG LEGISLATION.

## OMNIBUS DRUG ENFORCEMENT, EDUCATION, AND CONTROL ACT ALLOCATIONS

THE OMNIBUS DRUG BILL OF 1986 PROVIDED CUSTOMS WITH $137 MILLION OVER AND ABOVE THE 863.8 MILLION THAT CONGRESS HAD PROVIDED CUSTOMS THROUGH THE NORMAL APPROPRIATIONS PROCESS BRINGING CUSTOMS TOTAL FY 87 BUDGET TO SLIGHTLY OVER $1 BILLION. OF THIS $137 MILLION, 44 MILLION WAS AUTHORIZED FOR THE CUSTOMS SALARIES AND EXPENSE ACCOUNT, AND $93.1 MILLION WAS AUTHORIZED FOR THE AIR PROGRAM OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE ACCOUNT.

SINCE THE DRUG BILL WAS SIGNED BY THE PRESIDENT ON OCTOBER 27, 1986, CUSTOMS HAS GONE FORWARD WITH THE HIRING OF 996 NEW PERSONNEL. THE REMAINDER OF THE $44 MILLION IS BEING USED TO PURCHASE EQUIPMENT FOR THE MARINE PROGRAM, INCLUDING MARINE RADAR EQUIPMENT FOR THE GULF COAST, AND VOICE PRIVACY RADIOS. A PORTION OF THESE FUNDS WILL ALSO BE USED TO ENHANCE CUSTOMS SECONDARY INSPECTION CAPABILITIES AT PORTS ALONG THE SOUTHWEST BORDER.

THE 93.1 MILLION IN ADDITIONAL OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE FUNDS ARE BEING USED IN A NUMBER OF DIFFERENT AREAS OF CUSTOMS AIR PROGRAM WHICH WILL BE DISCUSSED IN DETAIL LATER IN THIS STATEMENT. THE PROGRAMS RECEIVING SUPPORT FROM THESE FUNDS WILL BE THE FOLLOWING:

- REFITTING OF CUSTOMS P-3A WITH 360 DEGREE LOOK DOWN RADAR

- DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION OF THE COMMAND, CONTROL, COMMUNICATIONS, AND INTELLIGENCE CENTER

- ENHANCEMENT OF THE BAHAMAS TASK FORCE

- DEPLOYMENT AND OPERATION OF FOUR ADDITIONAL BLACKHAWK HELICOPTERS

- MODIFICATION OF C-12 AIRCRAFT FOR MARINE TRACKING PURPOSES

- PURCHASE AND EQUIPPING OF CITATION II INTERCEPTOR AIRCRAFT

- DEPLOYMENT AND OPERATION OF E2-C DETECTION AIRCRAFT

AS YOU KNOW MR. CHAIRMAN, I AM CONCERNED ABOUT THE SERIOUS NARCOTICS THREAT ON THE SOUTHWEST BORDER. ACCORDINGLY THE BULK OF PERSONNEL AND ASSETS PROVIDED BY THE OMNIBUS DRUG BILL HAVE BEEN ALLOCATED TO THE SOUTHWEST SECTOR OF THE COUNTRY. THAT BRINGS ME TO A DISCUSSION OF OPERATION ALLIANCE

## OPERATION ALLIANCE

OPERATION ALLIANCE STARTED IN JUNE 1986. IT FOCUSES ON THE NARCOTICS SMUGGLING ALONG THE SOUTHWEST BORDER. COOPERATION BETWEEN CUSTOMS, STATE, LOCAL AND SISTER FEDERAL AGENCIES IS THE KEY TO THIS EFFORT.

A JOINT COMMAND GROUP HAS BEEN ESTABLISHED IN THE SOUTHWEST REGION CONSISTING OF SENIOR OFFICIALS FROM THE COAST GUARD, CUSTOMS SERVICE, DRUG ENFORCEMENT ADMINISTRATION, FBI, INS/BORDER PATROL AND REPRESENTATIVES FROM ARIZONA, CALIFORNIA, NEW MEXICO AND TEXAS LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES. THE OPERATIONAL LEADERSHIP

OF OPERATION ALLIANCE HAS BEEN ESTABLISHED ON A ROTATIONAL BASIS. CUSTOMS SOUTHWEST REGIONAL COMMISSIONER RAN OPERATION ALLIANCE DURING ITS FIRST SIX MONTHS. CONTROL HAS SINCE PASSED TO A SENIOR OFFICIAL IN THE IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE'S (INS) BORDER PATROL.

CUSTOMS BEGAN ALLOCATING ADDITIONAL RESOURCES TO THE SOUTHWEST BORDER IN MAY OF 1986, WELL BEFORE ANNOUNCEMENT OF OPERATION ALLIANCE. DURING FY 1986 CUSTOMS ALLOCATED AN ADDITIONAL 384 POSITIONS TO THE SOUTHWEST BORDER. SO FAR IN 1987 CUSTOMS HAS ALLOCATED AN ADDITIONAL 563 POSITIONS TO THE SOUTHWEST BORDER FOR A TOTAL OF 947 SINCE MAY OF LAST YEAR. THESE ALLOCATIONS WHICH INCLUDED AN INCREASE OF 264 INSPECTORS ALONG THE BORDER, ARE HAVING A TREMENDOUS IMPACT ON SMUGGLERS. FOR EXAMPLE, AT SOUTHWEST BORDER PORTS OF ENTRY THROUGH THE END OF FY 86, COCAINE SEIZURES WERE UP OVER 250 PERCENT FROM 124.4 POUNDS TO 443.5 POUNDS.

AS PART OF "BLUE FIRE", CUSTOMS CONTRIBUTION TO OPERATION ALLIANCE, CUSTOMS HAS LOANED 375 RADIOS TO LOCAL AND STATE LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES SO THEIR UNITS CAN COMMUNICATE WITH CUSTOMS AS LAW ENFORCEMENT ACTIONS TAKE PLACE. STATE AND LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES KNOW THEIR LOCAL COMMUNITIES AND HAVE SOURCES AND ACCESS TO INFORMATION THAT WOULD BE IMPOSSIBLE TO DUPLICATE.

I HAVE PERSONNALLY MET WITH MORE THAN A HUNDRED STATE AND LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICIALS FROM FLORIDA TO CALIFORNIA TO ENLIST THEIR SUPPORT. WE ARE ACTIVELY GAINING ALLIES THROUGHOUT THE ENTIRE NATION AND WE ARE PROVIDING THE STATE AND LOCAL ORGANIZATION WITH VOICE PRIVACY RADIOS FOR THEIR CARS, AND TRANSPONDERS FOR THEIR BOATS. LOCAL AND STATE AUTHORITIES ARE ALSO NOW GETTING MORE OPPORTUNITIES WHILE ON JOINT OPERATIONS WITH CUSTOMS TO OBTAIN ASSETS SEIZED FROM NARCOTICS OFFENDERS THROUGH THEIR OWN JURISDICTIONS FORFEITURE LAWS.

THE NATIONWIDE INSTITUTIONALIZATION OF CUSTOMS COOPERATIVE EFFORTS WITH STATE AND LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES, WHICH STARTED WITH THE HIGHLY SUCCESSFUL BLUE LIGHTNING EXCERCISE IN SOUTH FLORIDA IN 1985, IS INDISPENSABLE TO A SUCCESSFUL LONG-TERM INTERDICTION STRATEGY.

## AIR INTERDICTION

AS STATED AND DOCUMENTED EARLIER IN THIS STATEMENT, CUSTOMS AUTHORITY AT OR BETWEEN PORTS-OF-ENTRY IS PREEMINENT. THIS AUTHORITY HAS OVER THE YEARS ENABLED CUSTOMS TO EXERCISE EXTRAORDINARY SEARCH AND SEIZURE POWERS OVER OPERATORS OF GENERAL AVIATION AIRCRAFT AS THEY ENTER THE U.S. FROM ABROAD.

THE RESOURCES THAT CUSTOMS HAS HAD AVAILABLE TO ACCOMPLISH THIS MISSION HAVE GROWN CONSIDERABLY SINCE EARLY 1984. OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE FUNDING HAS INCREASED FROM $31 MILLION IN FY 1984 TO $170.9 MILLION IN FY 1987.

TO COMBAT THE INCREASED AIR SMUGGLING THREAT AND BETTER UTILIZE ITS NEW ASSETS, THE CUSTOMS SERVICE HAS STREAMLINED ITS ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE, ADDED PERSONNEL AND EXTENDED HOURS OF OPERATION.

CUSTOMS HAS ESTABLISHED AGENT INVESTIGATIVE GROUPS AT EACH AVIATION BRANCH TO CONDUCT INVESTIGATIONS RELATED TO SMUGGLING CONTRABAND BY AIRCRAFT. CUSTOMS ENFORCEMENT OFFICES HAVE RECENTLY BEEN OPENED IN SAN ANGELO, TEXAS AND OKLAHOMA CITY, OKLAHOMA. THE OFFICES ARE DEDICATED TO INVESTIGATING ALL NARCOTICS SEIZURES BY CUSTOMS AVIATION BRANCHES AND DEVELOPING AIR INVESTIGATIONS BY USING CONFIDENTIAL SOURCES OF INFORMATION FROM WITHIN THE AVIATION COMMUNITY.

THE OMNIBUS DRUG BILL PROVIDED THE CUSTOMS SERVICE WITH TWO E-2C AIRCRAFT, FOUR ADDITIONAL BLACK HAWK HELICOPTERS, TWO ADDITIONAL HIGH SPEED INTERCEPT AIRCRAFT, FIVE AEROSTATS AND FUNDS TO MODIFY THE C-12 AIRCRAFT WITH SOPHISTICATED SENSOR EQUIPMENT AND TO ENHANCE OUR P-3 AIRCRAFT WITH 360 DEGREE LOOK DOWN RADAR.

THE TWO E-2C AIRCRAFT WERE OBTAINED FROM THE U.S. NAVY ON FEBRUARY 7, 1987. THESE AIRCRAFT ARE CURRENTLY OPERATING OUT OF THE NAVAL AIR STATION IN SAN DIEGO AND ARE BEING UTILIZED TO TRAIN CUSTOMS PILOTS AND SENSOR OPERATORS. WE WILL BEGIN LIMITED OPERATIONAL FLIGHTS IN CONJUNCTION WITH THE SOUTHWEST'S U.S. AIR FORCE STRATEGIC OPERATIONS COMMAND CENTER (SOCC) AT RIVERSIDE, CALIFORNIA, IN EARLY APRIL AND EXPECT TO HAVE THE AIRCRAFT OPERATIONALLY DEPLOYED IN CORPURS CHRISTI, TEXAS, IN EARLY JULY 1987. THE E-2C'S WILL GIVE CUSTOMS THE ABILITY TO FLY SUSTAINED MISSIONS ON THE SOUTHERN BORDER AND OVER THE GULF OF MEXICO. THESE AIRCRAFT, IN ADDITION TO THE PLACEMENT OF AEROSTATS WILL GIVE CUSTOMS A GREATLY ENHANCED ABILITY TO STOP THE ILLICIT MOVEMENT OF DRUGS BY AIR.

FOUR BLACK HAWK HELICOPTERS WERE AUTHORIZED IN THE DRUG BILL. TWO OF THESE HELICOPTERS WERE DELIVERED TO CUSTOMS ON JANUARY 21, 1987. THE THIRD HELICOPTER WAS DELIVERED ON MARCH 11, 1987, AND THE FINAL BLACK HAWK IS TENTATIVELY SCHEDULED FOR

MID-APRIL 1987. THE FIRST BLACK HAWK RECEIVED WAS ASSIGNED TO THE NEW ORLEANS AVIATION BRANCH, THE SECOND WAS ASSIGNED TO THE HOUSTON AVIATION BRANCH AND THE REMAINING TWO WILL BE ASSIGNED TO THE SAN ANGELO, TEXAS AVIATION BRANCH.

WE ARE MAKING PREPARATIONS TO MODIFY THE TWO ADDITIONAL CITATION II AIRCRAFT TO PERFORM AS HIGH SPEED INTERCEPTORS. IN FEBRUARY 1987, WE PURCHASED A CITATION II FROM THE U.S. POSTAL SERVICE AND WE HAVE RECENTLY INITIATED ACTION TO PURCHASE A SECOND AIRCRAFT. THESE TWO AIRCRAFT WILL BE MODIFIED WITH SENSOR EQUIPMENT SIMILAR TO THE SIX AIRCRAFT WE PRESENTLY HAVE IN OPERATION. WE EXPECT THESE TWO INTERCEPTORS TO BE OPERATIONAL BY OCTOBER 1, 1987. THEY WILL BE ASSIGNED TO THE SAN DIEGO AND ALBUQUERQUE AVIATION BRANCHES.

AS STATED EARLIER, THE DRUG BILL FUNDED FIVE ADDITIONAL AEROSTATS. THE FT. HUACHUCA AEROSTAT, PARTIALLY FUNDED IN PREVIOUS CUSTOMS BUDGETS, WILL BE AVAILABLE FOR SITE PREPARATION AND OPERATION EVALUATION BY OCTOBER 1987, AND IS EXPECTED TO BE TOTALLY OPERATIONAL BY DECEMBER 1987. THE OTHER FOLLOWING FOUR SITES HAVE BEEN SELECTED AFTER CONSULTATION WITH THE AIR FORCE FOR OTHER BALLOONS: MOORE FIELD, McALLEN, TEXAS; ELEPHANT MOUNTAIN IN TEXAS; DEMING, NEW MEXICO; AND CHILDS MOUNTAIN IN ARIZONA.

THE SPECIFICATIONS FOR SENSOR EQUIPMENT TO BE INSTALLED ON THE C-12 AIRCRAFT ARE BEING DEVELOPED. WE EXPECT TO EQUIP THESE AIRCRAFT WITH SENSORS SIMILAR TO THOSE INSTALLED IN THE CUSTOMS HIGH ENDURANCE TRACKER (CHET). AT THE PRESENT, WE ARE HAVING THE C-12'S EQUIPPED WITH SOPHISTICATED VOICE COMMUNICATIONS EQUIPMENT.

CUSTOMS IS NOW COORDINATING WITH THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE TO ACQUIRE THE AN/APS-138 RADAR SYSTEM FOR THE P-3 AIRCRAFT. ONCE WE RECEIVE ASSURANCE FROM THE DEFENSE DEPARTMENT THAT THE RADAR IS AVAILABLE TO CUSTOMS, WE SHOULD BE UNDER CONTRACT WITHIN 60 DAYS. WE HAVE BEEN ASSURED THAT 17 MONTHS AFTER THE CONTRACT AWARD WE WILL HAVE THE PROTOTYPE AIRCRAFT. IN ADDITION TO THE MODIFICATION OF THE P-3 TO INSTALL THE APS-138, WE ARE PROGRESSING WITH A SECOND MODIFICATION PROGRAM TO INSTALL THE BLUESTAR/RADPAK ON TWO P-3'S. ONCE INSTALLED THIS SYSTEM WILL PROVIDE AIRBORNE MONITORING AND DIRECTION FINDING CAPABILITY. WE EXPECT TO BEGIN THE FIRST AIRCRAFT MODIFICATION BY JUNE 1987 AND HAVE IT COMPLETED SIX MONTHS LATER.

## MARINE INTERDICTION

CUSTOMS IS CONTINUING TO GIVE THE MARINE INTERDICTION PROGRAM A HIGH PRIORITY. CUSTOMS MARINE INVENTORY NOW STANDS AT 247 VESSELS. SINCE JANUARY 1986, WE HAVE ACQUIRED 30 INTERCEPTOR VESSELS, 10 SUPPORT VESSELS AND 3 RADAR PLATFORMS. WE ARE NOW IN THE PROCESS OF ACQUIRING 20 ADDITIONAL VESSELS WITH FUNDS PROVIDED IN THE DRUG BILL.

## BAHAMAS INITIATIVE TASK FORCE

IN RECOGNITION OF THE INCREASED UTILIZATION OF THE BAHAMAS AS A TRANSSHIPMENT POINT FOR NARCOTICS DESTINED FOR NORTH AMERICA, THE U.S. HAS BEGUN AN INITIATIVE WITH THE BAHAMAS THAT WILL ENABLE THE U.S. TO CONDUCT JOINT MARITIME LAW ENFORCEMENT ACTIVITIES IN THE TERRITORIAL WATERS OF THE BAHAMAS AND ON THE HIGH SEAS. THIS INITIATIVE CONSISTS OF AIRCRAFT (HELICOPTERS), RADAR PLATFORMS AND INTERCEPTOR VESSELS STATIONED IN THE BAHAMAS AND MANNED BY U.S. AND BAHAMIAN OFFICERS. THESE RESOURCES PROVIDE THE ABILITY TO DETECT AND IMMDIATELY RESPOND TO SUSPECT TARGETS ACQUIRED FROM A VARIETY OF SOURCES, INCLUDING AIRCRAFT OBSERVATIONS AND RADAR. THIS INITIATIVE WILL ACCOMPLISH TWO PRIMARY OBJECTIVES: THE SEIZURE OF SIGNIFICANT QUANTITIES OF NARCOTICS AND THE DISRUPTION OF BAHAMAS BASED NARCOTICS SMUGGLING GROUPS.

THE OMNIBUS DRUG BILL PROVIDED $10 MILLION FOR THE BAHAMAS TASK FORCE. THE LAW ALLOCATED $9 MILLION FOR THE PROCUREMENT AND OPERATION OF THREE DRUG INTERDICTION PURSUIT HELICOPTERS AND $1 MILLION TO ENHANCE COMMUNICATIONS CAPABILITIES WITHIN THE BAHAMAS ISLANDS.

## BLUE LIGHTNING OPERATIONAL COMMAND CENTER

AS YOU KNOW MR. CHAIRMAN, THE BLUE LIGHTNING OPERATIONS COMMAND CENTER (BLOCC) WAS ESTABLISHED IN MIAMI, FLORIDA, ON FEBRUARY 11, 1986. CUSTOMS ASSETS CURRENTLY BEING COORDINATED BY THE BLOCC INCLUDE 85 VESSELS, 340 CUSTOMS OFFICERS, 10 SHORE BASED MARINE RADAR SITES, AND THREE AEROSTAT BALLOONS. OVER 25 LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES HAVE ALREADY JOINED, CONTRIBUTING RESOURCES OF 260 OFFICERS AND ABOUT 90 VESSELS EACH EQUIPPED WITH A CUSTOMS TRANSPONDER AND A VOICE PRIVACY RADIO. THE NATIONAL PARK SERVICE, THE U.S. BORDER PATROL AND THE COAST GUARD HAVE ALSO JOINED. EFFORTS ARE NOW UNDERWAY TO INCLUDE WESTERN AND NORTHERN FLORIDA WHICH WILL MORE THAN DOUBLE THE ASSETS.

SIMILAR MARINE OPERATIONS COMMAND CENTERS ARE NOW BEING ESTABLISHED IN HOUSTON, TEXAS AND GULFPORT, MISSISSIPPI. AIR INTERDICTION STRATEGIES ARE SIMILAR TO THE MARINE STRATGY. THE DETECTING, TRACKING, INTERCEPTION AND APPREHENSION OF SUSPECT

AIRCRAFT IS COMPLEX, REQUIRING DIFFERENT TYPES OF AIRCRAFT ON A SINGLE PURSUIT. COMMUNICATION NEEDS ARE EXTENSIVE NOT ONLY WITH THE AIR INTERDICTION COMPONENTS BUT ALSO WITH GROUP SUPPORT IN THE EVENT THE AIRCRAFT IS FORCED TO LAND. THE AIR INTERDICTION ASSETS ARE USED NOT ONLY IN APPREHENDING AIRBORNE TARGETS BUT ALSO IN IDENTIFYING MARINE AND AT TIMES LAND TARGETS AS WELL. A SOPHISTICATED COMMUNICATIONS CAPABILITY IS A CRITICAL PART OF THE AIR INTERDICTION STRATEGY. FOR THIS REASON, CUSTOMS REALIZED THE NEED FOR COMMAND, CONTROL, COMMUNICATIONS, AND INTELLIGENCE CENTERS IN THE EARLY 1970'S.

## COMMAND, CONTROL, COMMUNICATIONS AND INTELLIGENCE CENTERS

THE C3I IS A COMMAND CENTER WHERE REAL-TIME INTERDICTION DECISIONS ARE MADE BASED ON REAL-TIME INFORMATION FROM NUMEROUS SOURCES. SOURCES OF INFORMATION INCLUDE: FAA, CUSTOMS AND DOD RADARS; NORAD; EPIC; FULLY DEDICATED DRUG INTERDICTION RADAR IN THE AIR, SEA, AND ON LAND, TECS, THE INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY; FEDERAL, STATE, AND LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES; TRANSPONDERS INSTALLED ON AIRCRAFT AND VESSELS; DRUG INTERDICTION INVESTIGATIONS, PRIVATE CITIZEN HOTLINES, ETC. THE C3I WILL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR ALL CUSTOMS AIR INTERDICTION ASSETS AS WELL AS MARINE INTERDICTION ASSETS. THE C3I INCLUDE OTHER FEDERAL AGENCIES INVOLVED IN DRUG INTERDICTION AND STATE AND LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES WHOSE RESOURCES WILL BE COORDINATED BY THE C3I WHEN THEIR MISSION CONTRIBUTES TO THE OVERALL DRUG INTERDICTION MISSION.

CONGRESS FIRST DIRECTED THAT THE CUSTOMS SERVICE BEGIN EFFORTS ON DESIGNING AND DEVELOPING THE C3I CONCEPT IN 1984. THE CONCEPT SHOWED GREAT PROMISE AND CONGRESS APPROPRIATED $2 MILLION IN FISCAL YEAR 1985, $4 MILLION IN FISCAL YEAR 1986 AND $25 MILLION IN THE DRUG BILL OF 1986. THE MAJORITY OF THE DESIGN AND DEVELOPMENT WORK IS NEARING COMPLETION AND WHAT REMAINS IS THE ACTUAL CONSTRUCTION AND EQUIPPING OF FACILITIES.

MY STATEMENT SHOULD MAKE IT CLEAR, MR. CHAIRMAN THAT THE OMNIBUS DRUG ENFORCEMENT, EDUCATION, AND CONTROL ACT OF 1986 HAS HAD A SIGNIFICANT IMPACT ON CUSTOMS ABILITY TO CONTINUE IN THE WAR ON DRUGS. I WOULD BE PLEASED TO ANSWER ANY QUESTIONS YOU OR OTHER MEMBERS OF THE PANEL MAY HAVE.

## OPENING STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE BENJAMIN A. GILMAN
## HEARING ON DRUG INTERDICTION, APRIL 30, 1987

---

THANK YOU, MR. CHAIRMAN. IT IS A PLEASURE FOR ME TO WELCOME BACK OUR DISTINGUISHED PANEL OF WITNESSES TO DISCUSS OUR OVERALL DRUG INTERDICTION EFFORTS AT THE PRESENT TIME.

DESPITE OUR EFFORTS TO DATE, WHICH HAVE RESULTED IN REPORTS OF MORE AND MORE SEIZURES OF ILLICIT DRUGS, IT WAS ESTIMATED THAT IN 1986, 178 TONS OF COCAINE WERE DIRECTED AT THE UNITED STATES BY THE DRUG TRAFFICKERS. OF THE 178 TONS, ONLY 28 TONS WERE SEIZED, WITH THE REMAINING 150 TONS BEING CONSUMED BY OUR CITIZENS.

IN ADDITION, ESTIMATES ARE THAT BETWEEN 30,000 AND 60,000 TONS OF MARIJUANA CONTINUE TO BE SMUGGLED INTO THE UNITED STATES ANNUALLY. TO ADD FUEL TO THE FIRE, THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE IN ITS ANNUAL REPORT TO THE CONGRESS ON INTERNATIONAL NARCOTICS CONTROL, REPORTED BUMPER CROPS OF ILLICIT DRUGS IN SOURCE COUNTRIES IN 1986.

CLEARLY, WE CANNOT EXPECT THE FLOOD OF DRUGS BEING DIRECTED AT OUR SHORES TO DIMINISH AT ANY TIME IN THE NEAR FUTURE. ONE RAY OF HOPE AT THE PRESENT TIME IS THAT PRODUCING NATIONS, WHICH ARE BECOMING CONSUMING NATIONS, ARE RECOGNIZING THE DEVASTATING EFFECT THAT DRUG TRAFFICKING AND DRUG ABUSE ARE HAVING ON THEIR INSTITUTIONS AND THEY ARE JOINING IN A COMMON EFFORT TO COMBAT THIS EPIDEMIC THAT IS A SCOURGE ON ALL MANKIND.

THE ANTI-DRUG ABUSE ACT OF 1986 SOUGHT TO DEAL WITH THE PROBLEMS THAT WE FACE BY VIGOROUSLY ATTACKING BOTH THE SUPPLY OF AND DEMAND FOR DRUGS. IT IS CLEAR THAT UNTIL WE REDUCE THE DEMAND FOR DRUGS WITHIN OUR OWN BORDERS, WE WILL CONTINUE TO BE BOMBARDED WITH DRUGS FROM ABROAD. UNTIL THAT DAY, HOWEVER, INTERDICTION OF THESE ILLICIT SUBSTANCES WILL REMAIN OUR FIRST LINE OF DEFENSE AGAINST THE DRUG TRAFFICKERS. AT THE PRESENT TIME, THE U.S. COAST GUARD AND THE U.S. CUSTOMS SERVICE SHARE RESPONSIBILITY FOR THAT FIRST LINE OF DEFENSE.

IN DRAFTING THE ANTI-DRUG ABUSE ACT, CONGRESS RECOGNIZED THAT THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT'S RESPONSE TO DRUG TRAFFICKING AND DRUG ABUSE WAS DIVIDED AMONG SEVERAL DEPARTMENTs AND AGENCIES, AND THAT SOMETIMES AREAS OF RESPONSIBILITY OVERLAPPED. THE ACT SOUGHT TO DEAL WITH THIS SITUATION BY REQUIRING THE PRESIDENT TO SUBMIT TO THE CONGRESS RECOMMENDATIONS FOR LEGISLATION TO REORGANIZE THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH TO COMBAT MORE EFFECTIVELY AND EFFICIENTLY DRUG TRAFFICKING AND DRUG ABUSE. THOSE RECOMMENDATIONS ARE DUE ON MAY 13, 1987.

AS WE AWAIT THE RECOMMENDATIONS, HOWEVER, REPORTS HAVE SURFACED INDICATING CONFLICTS AMONG AGENCIES THAT APPARENTLY WISH TO PROTECT THEIR TURF OR AT LEAST MAINTAIN THE STATUS QUO IN TERMS OF THEIR DUTIES AND OVERALL RESPONSIBILITIES. SUCH A REPORT APPEARED IN THE WASHINGTON POST ONLY TWO DAYS AGO REGARDING THE AIR INTERDICTION RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE COAST GUARD AND CUSTOMS SERVICE.

I WOULD HOPE THAT OUR DISTINGUISHED WITNESSES WOULD BE ABLE TO TELL US WHAT, IF ANYTHING, THE NATIONAL DRUG POLICY BOARD IS DOING TO RESOLVE SUCH CONFLICTS AND WHAT RECOMMENDATIONS, IF ANY, THEY WOULD SUGGEST FOR THE CONGRESS TO CONSIDER.

WHATEVER THE OUTCOME OF ANY POTENTIAL REORGANIZATION, IT IS CLEAR THAT COORDINATION AND COOPERATION ARE THE CORNERSTONES IN OUR EFFORTS TO INTERDICT DRUGS AT OUR SHORES, AND THE NATIONAL DRUG POLICY BOARD WILL PLAY A KEY ROLE IN PROMOTING SUCH TEAMWORK. THE ANTI-DRUG ABUSE ACT PROVIDED A VARIETY OF INCREASED RESOURCES TO BOTH THE COAST GUARD AND THE CUSTOMS SERVICE, BUT THESE INCREASED RESOURCES WILL BE OF LITTLE VALUE IF WE FAIL IN OUR EFFORTS TO RESOLVE THE TURF BATTLES.

I HOPE THAT EACH OF YOU WILL ADDRESS THESE ISSUES TODAY, AND BRING US UP TO DATE NOT ONLY ON WHAT YOU HAVE BEEN ABLE TO ACCOMPLISH WITH YOUR INCREASED RESOURCES, BUT ALSO ON WHAT YOUR NEEDS AND PROBLEMS ARE A THE PRESENT TIME.

THANK YOU, MR. CHAIRMAN.

○